



BL 53 .K49 1928

Keyser, Leander Sylvester,
1856-

A handbook of Christian
psychology

OTHER BOOKS BY DR. KEYSER

A System of Christian Evidence

(Fourth Edition)

A System of General Ethics

(Third Edition)

A System of Natural Theism

(Second Edition)

A Manual of Christian Ethics

The Problem of Origins

Man's First Disobedience

**The Conflict of Fundamentalism and
Modernism**

The Doctrines of Modernism

In the Redeemer's Footsteps

In the Apostles' Footsteps



A HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN PSYCHOLOGY

BY

LEANDER S. KEYSER, D. D.

Professor of Systematic Theology
in Hamma Divinity School, Wittenberg College,
Springfield, Ohio



1928

THE LUTHERAN LITERARY BOARD
BURLINGTON, IOWA

Copyright, 1928
By R. NEUMANN
Burlington, Iowa

Made in U. S. A.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION

THIS Handbook was first published as a brochure and only in outline form. It was primarily intended for the author's own use as a teacher of Christian Psychology. Thinking that it might also be serviceable to others, he issued an edition running into a good many hundreds. To his surprise, the demand for it became so great that, almost before he was aware of what was happening, the edition was exhausted, and he had no more copies left even for his own use.

Then came the request from the present publishers and from numerous readers and teachers for a new edition. The general consensus, however, seemed to be that the work should be enlarged by further discussion of the various topics. Such expansion has been made in the present edition. Not only have the original topics been greatly developed, but many new features and much new material have been added. The arrangement of the subject-matter has been considerably modified, and, the author believes, greatly improved.

For whom is the work designed? First, for teachers and students in Theological Seminaries, Bible Institutes, and other Christian schools whose faculties may desire to include this useful discipline in their curricula; second, for general readers who may be interested in the study of the human mind from the Christian viewpoint.

Since Christian people must constantly deal with the human mind, Christian Psychology is surely a very practical

discipline. Besides, Christianity offers a real contribution to the study of human psychology. The author ventures to hope that workers in the sphere of General Psychology will give earnest consideration to what Christianity has to teach regarding the science of the mind.

*Hamma Divinity School,
Springfield, Ohio.*

L. S. K.

GENERAL OUTLINE

PART I
INTRODUCTORY DATA

PART II
BIBLICAL PSYCHOLOGY

PART III
CORRELATION OF BIBLICAL AND
SCIENTIFIC PSYCHOLOGY

PART IV
APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
PART I	
INTRODUCTORY DATA	
CHAPTER I	
I. Definitions	9
II. Psychology as a Science	14
III. Relations of Christian Psychology.....	17
—	
PART II	
BIBLICAL PSYCHOLOGY	
CHAPTER II	
I. Introductory Notes	21
II. Man a Dual Being.....	23
III. Man a Dichotomy	27
CHAPTER III	
IV. Psychical Terms in the Bible.....	30
CHAPTER IV	
V. Biblical Doctrine of Man as a Psychical Being...	36
—	
PART III	
CORRELATION OF BIBLICAL AND SCIENTIFIC PSYCHOLOGY	
CHAPTER V	
I. Introductory Remarks	63
II. The Anti-Christian Theories	64

	Page
CHAPTER VI	
III. The Biblical and Scientific View.....	78
CHAPTER VII	
IV. Analysis of the Human Mind.....	96
1. The Intellect	97
CHAPTER VIII	
IV. Analysis of the Human Mind (continued).....	112
1. The Intellect (continued)	112
CHAPTER IX	
IV. Analysis of the Human Mind (continued).....	127
2. The Sensibilities (Emotions)	127
3. The Will	131
<hr/>	
PART IV	
APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY	
CHAPTER X	
I. Why a Brief Treatment	139
II. Some Practical Suggestions	140
Addendum I: O. M. Norlie's Christian Psychology...	150
Addendum II: Gestalt Psychology	152
Addendum III: Is Man a Dichotomy or a Trichotomy? 155	155
Addendum IV: Bibliography	157
Index	165

A HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN PSYCHOLOGY

PART I INTRODUCTORY DATA

CHAPTER I

I. DEFINITIONS.

1. OF PSYCHOLOGY.

Psychology is the science of the human mind and its varied activities and relations.

This definition corresponds with the etymology of the term: *psyche*, mind, and *logos*, a reasoned account. If there is no such an entity as the mind, the term psychology is a misnomer for our science, and therefore a truly descriptive term should be sought. To say that psychology is merely the science of behavior is to confuse cause and effect, activity with actor, *phenomenon* with *noumenon*.

Just as we say that physical science deals with material entities and their phenomena, so we ought to be logical and say that mental science deals with psychical entities and their phenomena. Let us not be afraid to admit that wherever there are *phenomena*, there must be *noumena* (things in themselves), as will be shown later on in our discussion.

Neither should we be frightened by the accusation that “mind” is a “metaphysical” term. Of course, it is such a

term, if by "metaphysical" we mean something above and different from physical objects, for that is precisely what the mind is, since most of its activities are *sui generis*, and are incapable of being depicted in merely material and mechanical terms.

A good definition is given by Professor Hervin U. Roop in his work, *General Psychology* (1927) : "Psychology is the science of mental processes, or the phenomena of the self as conscious of objects" (p. 30); only we think a definition should not be a double one, with its two parts connected by "or"; besides, the term "self" strikes us as being just as metaphysical as is the term "mind."

2. OF CHRISTIAN PSYCHOLOGY.

Christian Psychology is the science of the human mind and its varied activities and relations in the light of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, in correlation with the valid conclusions of General Psychology.

It is hoped that no fault will be found with this definition; for, as will be shown later, the Christian Scriptures throw much light on the operations of the human mind. Christian Psychology is not simply Biblical Psychology; it does not merely state and classify the psychical teaching of the Bible, but also develops it, defends it, and shows that it is in harmony with the best results of psychological research in all history. These statements, it is hoped, will be made good in the course of our investigations.

No fault should be found, we think, with the definitions above given because the term "human" is employed before the word "mind." Much is written now-a-days about "animal psychology"; but the term must be taken with a large degree of allowance, for no one can prove that animals *have* minds. In some ways they seem to possess such an entity,

for they exhibit a kind of intelligence; but, after all, this may be only an instinct given them by their Creator to enable them to exist and function in their divinely appointed sphere in the realm of nature. No animal can say, "I," or, "I am," or, "I am a self-conscious being," or, "I am a person who can think." All these statements can be predicated only of human beings. Therefore psychology, if we would speak with scientific precision, is a science which belongs strictly to the human sphere.

3. OF THE MIND.

The Mind is that entity, possessed by a human being, which is self-conscious, and which, in the light of its self-consciousness, knows, thinks, feels and wills.

As to its essence (*noumenon*), it is a psychical or mental entity in distinction from the body and other tangible objects, which are constituted of material essence. Some one has quite acutely defined the mind as "self-conscious substance." On the other hand, matter is non-conscious substance. Both of them, however, are so constituted as to exist together in a harmonious and orderly cosmos. No objection should be raised against the terms "essence" and "substance," as will appear in the next section.

4. OF AN ENTITY.

By an entity (*ens, entis, thing*) is meant something that has real concrete existence; "the thing itself;" *das Ding an sich*; an actual substance or essence; the *noumenon* in distinction from the *phenomenon*; the substance in distinction from its qualities, attributes and appearances.

It stands to reason that there must be something existent, or there could be no exhibitions of any kind. Nothing could reveal or display nothing. Without the *noumena* there could

be no *phenomena*. Therefore, the mind must be a something, or it could show forth no marks of its existence and activities.

Besides, if human beings have *experiences*, there must be something which knows and feels the experiences. Could there be even a physical or sensory experience, to say nothing of psychical, ethical and spiritual experiences, if there were no self-aware subject or entity to realize that experience? The question answers itself.

5. OF A MENTAL FACULTY.

A mental faculty is a specific functioning power or capacity of the human mind.

The word "faculty" is derived from *facio, facere*, to do. Used according to its etymology, therefore, it is not an objectionable term, although, strangely enough, it is often flouted at by modern writers on psychology. Perhaps a wrong use of the term in the past has in part brought it into disrepute; but let us try to employ it in the right way.

A faculty does not mean a *part* of the human mind, as if it were a material object that could be divided into pieces. A mental faculty means the whole mind acting in a specific way that can be more or less clearly distinguished from its other activities. The mind is doubtless a unitary entity, and when it acts, it acts as a whole or as an integer.

We may not be able to name all the faculties of the mind, just as the physicists and chemists have not as yet been able to discover and designate all the properties and components of matter; yet we can surely name and describe quite lucidly the chief functioning powers of the mind, such as knowing, feeling and willing. As we proceed, we shall investigate the several distinguishing characteristics of mental activity.

6. OF MENTALISM.

This term has come into vogue in recent years in some works on psychology, and is used in a technical sense. It is employed quite frequently by A. A. Roback in his cogent book, *Behaviorism and Psychology*. Mentalism is the view that man has a real mind. Therefore a mentalist is one who upholds the reality of the mind as a distinct entity that functions in a way all its own. A mentalist, if he is logical, must be a dualist, holding that both matter and mind are real subsistences and that they co-operate in the way of interaction.

7. OF THE BRAIN.

The brain, which is known as the central nervous system (including the spinal cord), may be defined as *the chief physical organ or instrument of the mind*.

While there can be little doubt, judging from universal human experience, that the mind dwells and functions in the whole body; yet the evidence seems to be quite clear that the brain is its chief organ and is the center of its operations. It would seem that experimental psychology and physico-psychical investigations have practically demonstrated this to be a fact. Injuries to certain parts of the brain inhibit, or at least distinctly impair, certain functioning powers of the mind.

Although we may be anticipating discussions that will come later, it should be said at this juncture that the mind and the brain are not to be regarded as being fused into one substance, after the manner of materialistic monism.

True, the mind and the brain are correlated and integrated in a marvelous and mysterious way, but they cannot consistently be merged into one entity. After all, the mutual relation and dependence of mind and matter in the

human personality are no more undecipherable fundamentally than are the inter-dependence of electrons, atoms and molecules in material substances. A view that is founded on experience and observation should not be rejected because it is fundamentally mysterious. Who can explain matter, energy, life? The phenomena of mind are no more incomprehensible. But we certainly do know from experience, if we know anything, that mind exists and that it is intimately connected with the body. Why is it not rational to conclude even thus early in our investigations that God created the mind and organized the body to be partners in the work and purpose of this mortal life? There is clear evidence of teleology in this marvelous correlation of mind and matter in human beings.

II. PSYCHOLOGY A SCIENCE.

Our discipline is a science for the following reasons: 1. It gathers data from experience and observation, and hence in this respect it is as empirical as any other science; 2. It endeavors to classify and arrange its data in systematic order, as is done in all worthy sciences; 3. Having found, examined and assembled its material, it draws from its findings the legitimate inferences or generalizations.

These categories cannot be reasonably disputed. Everything we know enters into and appeals to the center of our consciousness. Without mental powers we could have no experience, for we would not be aware of anything. Even our neurotic sensations must come within the range of our awareness or we would know nothing about them.

Thus the data of mental experience are just as capable of study, observation, classification and logical inference as are the data of any other science. We must never think so one-sidedly and superficially as to suppose that the only

discoverable facts in the world are those of sensory or physical experience. Indeed, high ideals, lofty aspirations, ethical perceptions and feelings and spiritual experiences are higher orders of data than are those that pertain only to our corporeal life.

Confirmatory of these statements, we quote the following pertinent remarks from Dr. Hervin U. Roop's *General Psychology*, to which reference has already been made:

"(1) . . . Psychology is a science, since it seeks an explanation of a definite field of factual experience, i. e., the facts of the mental life . . . The purpose of psychology is to predict and control mental events as a means toward more intelligent and consistent living . . .

"(2) . . . Psychology is an experimental or empirical science. It is such because it rests on experience, observation and induction—as the science of facts and the laws which regulate the same. Its object of investigation—the human mind—is a most important fact of nature, unless we exclude man himself from the world to which he belongs and of which he is lord."

Then our author adds that, if we can observe and classify the phenomena of nature, we can do the same with the phenomena of mind. If we can observe the habits of plants and animals, we can also observe the habits of men. If in the realm of nature we can make a careful induction of general truths and principles, we can do likewise in studying human experience and behavior. We quote again:

"The process of discovering truth is the same in all sciences: (1) Obtain the facts; (2) Classify them; (3) Form a theory; (4) Test the theory. This is what is meant by scientific investigation. All we know of either the science of matter or the science of mind is simply the phenomena

they exhibit. What the mind is in itself we do not know, but only its phenomena as presented to our observation and consciousness. It thinks and feels; it perceives, remembers, reasons; it loves, hates, desires, determines: these exercises are matters of experience and observation."

Neither do we know the essence of matter in itself, but observe only its phenomena. Hence the method of orientation and science-making is practically the same in the fields of both mind and matter.

In one respect, however, they differ. In the study of matter we deal with objects outside of our own being (objective facts); in the study of the mind the field of observation is largely within ourselves. "The phenomena are those of our own present or former consciousness; the mind is at once both the observer and the object observed."

This is the great fundamental and paramount distinction of the human mind: that it is at once both subject and object. No other entity is capable of this marvelous gift. Dr. Roop points out the advantages of the study of psychology over that of natural things:

"(1) The phenomena are fully within our reach; (2) They are capable of being known with greater certainty; (3) The knowledge given in conscious experience is more correct and reliable than any other. It cannot be disputed. The observer has within himself the essential elements of the science which he explores. The data which he constructs is the science of himself."¹

Thus we think we have shown that psychology is entitled to the name of science along side of all other honorable sciences.

1. See Hervin U. Roop, *General Psychology*, pp. 31-33. We regret that the exigencies of space do not permit our quoting this valuable treatise in full on these vital problems.

III. RELATIONS OF CHRISTIAN PSYCHOLOGY.

1. To PHYSICAL SCIENCE IN GENERAL.

Since man dwells in the natural cosmos as his arena of activity, and since every branch of science is the result of his investigation and thinking, psychology and all the physical sciences bear an intimate relation and should be able to establish a *modus vivendi*. Christian psychology has a special reason for dwelling in harmony with natural science; for, according to the Bible, "God created the heavens and the earth" (the basis of rational astronomy); He also developed and prepared the realm of nature for man's habitat; and then, when the work of creating and fashioning nature's realm was completed (Gen. 2:4), He formed man and placed him right in the midst of the natural realm. Surely God would not have made man a misfit in his natural environment. Everywhere the Bible teaches this twofold correlative truth—that man was made for nature and nature for man.

Moreover, Christian psychology must have an open mind toward all truth in the natural sciences and elsewhere, else it would not be *Christian*. Christianity is above all ethical, but it would be unethical to blind oneself through prejudice to any demonstrated truth. In the interest of wise discrimination it should be added, however, that Christian psychology cannot be expected to agree with the unproved speculations of men who are reputed as scientists. But there is, we hold, no conflict between true religion and true science.

2. To ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY.

As man is a compound of body (*soma*) and mind (*psyche*), their close mutual relation should always be recognized. Christian psychology, not only admits, but also insists on, this inter-dependence; yet at the same time it

avoids the error of merging mind and body into one substance, after the manner of the monistic theories. Recognizing man to be divinely constituted a dual being, Christian psychology looks with favor upon the most thoroughgoing scientific study of the human body and its connection with the mind which dwells within it.

3. To PHILOSOPHY.

Psychology has its philosophical problems, such as epistemology, conscience, volition, etc. It might be called a philosophico-scientific discipline. The psychologist who thinks deeply is not convinced that a sharp, hard-and-fast line of demarcation between science and philosophy can always be drawn. Indeed, no scientist, no matter what may be the special field of his researches, can wholly avoid noting and expressing what might be called philosophical implications —that is, no science can be purely and absolutely descriptive. The human mind is bent into the form of an interrogation-point; it will and must ever and anon ask the question, Why?

4. To CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS AND ETHICS.

Every Christian doctrine and moral principle has its psychological aspects and relations, and is possible of acceptance, development and application only because man is a psychical being. The various branches of Christian science go hand in hand. Some psychologists, even among those calling themselves Christian, make the mistake of trying to divorce theology and psychology. Thus they become one-sided, and vainly attempt to account for the total facts of Christian experience on too narrow a basis, as we shall show when we come to discuss the Christian Order of Salvation.

Instead of divorcing theology and psychology, and pitting

them against each other, we should correlate them, consider all the facts, and thus secure a total view. The gentle hint might here be given that the Christian psychologist should also be a specialist in Christian theology; otherwise he cannot determine and appreciate the meeting place of theology and psychology in Christian experience.

5. To CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS.

Since Christian truth fits so admirably into the deepest needs of the human soul, psychology forms a powerful apologetic for the Christian religion. It does seem likely that the Christian system of truth and salvation has been divinely instituted and revealed for the very purpose of meeting man's need and securing his highest well-being. In this respect, therefore, the chief data of Christian psychology may well be made a valuable section in a treatise on Christian Apologetics.²

On the other hand, if the Christian apologist has done his work thoroughly, he may as a psychologist take the Christian system for granted—save as certain unsettled questions may still arise in the inquirer's mind.

6. To THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA.

If Christian psychology is taught in a theological seminary, its place in Theological Encyclopedia may be, and perhaps should be, fixed, in order to correlate and orientate all the branches of theological science. The best classification of these disciplines in the curriculum of a theological school with which we are acquainted is given below, in which table the place of Christian psychology will be seen—provided, of course, the school faculty should assign it to

2. The author has tried to do this in his work entitled, *A System of Christian Evidence*, fourth edition, pp. 72-82.

the department of Systematic Theology. The several branches — with some subdivisions — of Christian theology are as follows:

I. EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

II. HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

III. SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

1. *Christian Dogmatics.*
2. *Christian Apologetics.*
3. *Christian Ethics.*
4. *Christian Psychology.*

IV. PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

Some theologians place the discipline known as BIBLICAL THEOLOGY (used in the technical sense) under Systematic Theology as number 1, since it may be regarded as the basis of the several branches that follow. The author thinks that, technically speaking, it may logically belong in that place. However, in some seminaries it is taught in the departments of Exegetical Theology, in the Old Testament department as Old Testament Theology, in the New Testament department as New Testament Theology. In other theological schools Biblical Theology is assigned to the department of Historical Theology.

However, our special interest here is in Christian Psychology, which may well be taught in connection with the other branches of Systematic Theology, and, if it is adequately handled, it will be properly correlated with them.

PART II BIBLICAL PSYCHOLOGY

CHAPTER II

I. INTRODUCTORY NOTES.

1. THE BIBLE THE SOURCE BOOK.

The Bible is the Source Book of the Christian system of truth and salvation. Of course, by the Bible we mean the entire Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments —that is, the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures. We have no other way of knowing what Christianity is save by the revelation given through the Word. When we speak of the religion of Christ, we mean the religion of the Christ who is historically revealed in the Bible. No other Christ is the true Christ; no other religion is the true, full-toned Christian religion.

The Christ of human rationalism is a modified, and usually a greatly reduced, Christ. The same is true of the Bible of rationalism: it is a very much abridged, dissected and mangled Bible, making fallible human reason the ultimate norm of truth. But the evangelical Christian accepts the whole Bible and the whole Christ, and the whole salvation proffered in the Bible and wrought for man by the sacrificial work of the divine-human Son of God. What real Christians need and want is to accept “the total fact of Christ.”¹

1. See Harold P. Sloan, *The Christ of the Ages*.

So, as we go to the Bible as the Source Book of Christian doctrine and ethics, we go to the Bible to discover the fundamental principles of a system of Christian Psychology. Whatever additional investigation and development we may carry on afterward, we go to the Bible first for our primal generic material and doctrine.

2. WHAT THE BIBLE DOES AND DOES NOT.

The Bible does not set forth a system of Psychology in scientific and classified form. That seems to be God's way in both the Bible and nature, namely, to display the fundamental facts, and then let man formulate his own science; and that is evidently the way that is best for man, because it gives him inspiring and profitable occupation. The same truth holds regarding Christian Dogmatics and Ethics: these sciences are not ready-made to our hands, but the source material for them is to be found in the Bible. In each case, including Psychology, a clear system in all vital matters can be deduced from the material furnished by the Bible, if it be studied in both its total revelation and its interesting minutiae.

It shall now be our purpose to arrange the data given in Holy Writ in such a way as to formulate a consistent system of Christian Psychology. For the time being we take it for granted that the Bible is divinely inspired. If we find its psychological teaching valid and scientific, corresponding with experience and observation, that fact will constitute a strong argument for its divine and supernatural character. This treatment belongs to what is known as the internal evidences of the trustworthiness and authority of the Bible as set forth in a system of Christian Apologetics.

II. MAN A DUAL BEING.

1. GENERAL REMARKS.

It seems to be clear that the impression made by the whole Biblical teaching is that man is composed of at least two entities: body and mind (or soul). Thus in Biblical Psychology we meet with "the mind-body problem" at the start. This has been one of the outstanding problems of psychology from time immemorial. It is worth while to discover what such a great and beneficent book as the Bible has to teach us on this much-mooted question. Besides, it is just as reasonable to try to formulate a science and arrive at rational inductions from Biblical material as from any other data that are capable of being assembled in an orderly system.

Whether man is a two-part being (a dichotomy) or a three-part being (a trichotomy), will be considered in due time.

2. PROOFS OF THE DUALISTIC VIEW.

(1) *Man's Creation.*

Of course, we are at present simply dealing with the clear teaching of the Bible on this point. According to its teaching, the primeval man was "made" and "created" in the divine image (Gen. 1:26, 27). The Hebrew verbs here used are *asah* (verse 26), meaning to make, and *bara* (verse 27), meaning to create. Neither of these verbs means to *grow*, *develop*, or *evolve*. If the Genesical writer had meant to teach that man's mind came into existence by a gradual process of growth or development, he should have used the right Hebrew verb; and he might have had his choice of at least half a dozen such verbs, as, for example, *gadal*, *dagah* or *tsamach*. But he uses the Hebrew equivalents of "made" (verse 26) and "created" (verse 27).

Hence, the conclusion is that the mind of primitive man was directly created in the divine similitude. It is evident that this image must refer to man's mind, or soul, or spirit, for God is a Spirit, according to our Lord's own teaching (John 4:24). So man's mind is composed of the same kind of essence as the being of God, namely, psychical or spiritual essence—only it is finite, while God is infinite.

But note further: Afterward the Biblical record (Gen. 2:7) teaches that man's body was fashioned (*yatsar*) by the Almighty from the finest material (*aphar*, dust) of the soil, and that God breathed into it "the breath of lives," and man became a living being, with (as the account afterward shows) a rational mind or soul (*nephesh*).

The theory of evolution cannot be derived from, and should not be read into (not eisegesis, but exegesis), this narrative of the forming of man's body; for the writer used the Hebrew verb *yatsar*, which means to mold or fashion, not to grow or develop. Had he meant to convey the concept of gradual development, he should have used *dagah*, *gadal*, *tsamach*, or even *yatsa*; but no! he added the Hebrew letter *Res* (English *r*), making it to *fashion* or *form*, so precise was he in the use of his verbs.

Sometimes it is said derisively that the Bible inculcates the gross idea that man's body was made of *mud*. But that charge is both irreverent and wrong, for it was "dust" (*aphar*), not mud, that was used, and *aphar* means the finest and cleanest portion of the soil, which had previously been created "very good" (Gen. 1:31). Man's body today is derived from the soil through what he eats. Would it be right to call him a *mud-eater*? Besides, when the body dies it moulders back to its "kindred element." "Dust thou art, to dust returnest." The Biblical teaching agrees with the facts.

Thus from the start man was created and fashioned a dual being, composed of mind and body, and he was always subsequently treated as if he possessed a rational soul, endued with something far higher psychically than mere natural or animal instinct. He was treated by his Creator as if he had been constituted as a genus of his own (*cf.* Gen. 1: 28-30; 2: 8, 15-24). No animal was created in the divine likeness; no animal's body was fashioned as was the body of man.

(2) *Later Biblical Teaching.*

Eccles. 12: 7: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return to God who gave it" (*cf.* 2: 7; 3: 19). A clear statement of this duality in man.

2 Sam. 12: 23 (David speaking of his deceased child): "But now he is dead, wherefore should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me."

Compare the Old Testament passages in which men are said to "go to their fathers," where the word *sheol* (not the word for grave) is used, meaning "the place of departed spirits." The dualistic view is taught in the Old Testament implicitly rather than explicitly, just as if it were a well-known fact and might be taken for granted.

Matt. 10: 28: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul (*psyche*): but rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

These are the words of Jesus Himself, and therefore ought to be decisive for those who believe that He was the divine-human Saviour. The idea here surely is that the dualism of man's personality carries over into the next life. The word "destroy" does not mean to annihilate the person

of man, but to extinguish his capacity for the true life of holy and happy fellowship with God.

Luke 12:20: "Thou fool, this night shall thy soul (*psyche*) be required of thee."

Luke 16:31: The parable of Dives and Lazarus surely teaches that there is a spiritual part of man's being which enters upon a conscious state of existence after the death of the body. The beggar, having died, was carried to Abraham's bosom, where he was "comforted" as a recompense for the sorrows and deprivations which he had endured here on earth. These predication can be made only of the soul. "The rich man also died, and was *buried*, and in *hades* he lifted up his eyes, being in torment." The expression, "was buried," connotes that his body was left dead on the earth; therefore it must have been his soul that persisted in another state of existence.²

Luke 23:43: Our Lord said to the penitent thief crucified by His side: "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise." This can refer only to the soul, because the bodies of both Christ and the thief were still left on the earth when they died. Jesus certainly taught that man had an imperishable life of self-conscious mentality.

Rev. 6:9: In his apocalyptic vision the apostle John beheld the souls (*psychas*) of the martyrs under the altar in the heavenly world. Again this supports the dualistic view.

Phil. 1:23, 24: "For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ; which is far better. Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you."

2. The colloquial expression, "Abraham's bosom," was used by the Jews to denote the upper part of Hades, or Paradise, while the lower part of Hades was called Tartarus, Gehenna, or "the place of torment."

Paul here teaches dualism, if language can be made to mean anything.

2 Cor. 5:6-9: "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord; for we walk by faith, not by sight: we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore, we labor that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of Him."

All the teaching of Christ and His apostles concerning the resurrection of the body at the final judgment connotes clearly that the disembodied souls of the saints, living with God in Paradise during the intermediate state, shall be re-united with their resurrected and glorified bodies, and then man, in the totality of his being, as he originally came from the creating and fashioning hand of God, shall go forth on his predetermined career of eternal bliss and glory and possibility.

III. MAN A DICHOTOMY.

1. THE VIEW OF TRICHOLOGY.

By some great Christian scholars man is regarded as a trichotomy, or a tripartite being, composed of body, soul and spirit. Dr. Franz Delitzsch, in his great work on *Biblical Psychology*, advocates this view. With not a little force Dr. Heard, in his *Man a Tripartite Being*, upholds the same doctrine, as does also Dr. J. G. Tanner in a work in every way worth considering.

There are some Biblical passages which seem to support the trichotomistic doctrine. 1 Thess. 5:23: "And I pray God your whole spirit (*pneuma*) and soul (*psyche*) and body (*soma*) be preserved blameless unto the coming of our

Lord Jesus Christ." Also Heb. 4:12: "For the Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit," etc. Here a distinction seems to be made between the soul and the spirit.

The author of this work desires to say that he feels no antagonism to the tripartite view of man, for if man is a threefold being, he is at least a dual being, and thus in either case the Bible teaches a doctrine that is utterly opposed to the monistic theories of our time. However, the writer prefers the two-part theory of man, believing it to be Biblically founded and most in accord with general psychology.

2. THE TWO-PART DOCTRINE.

(1) The arguments for trichotomy seem to prove too much. If every psychical term used in the Bible connotes a distinct entity, then man must be a multiple being instead of either bipartite or tripartite. Note Mark 12:30: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart (*kardia*), and with all thy soul (*psyche*), and with all thy mind (*dianoia*), and with all thy strength (*ischus*)."¹ This would make man a quadruple being.

In Hebrew 4:12 we have the three terms, soul (*psyche*), spirit (*pneuma*) and heart (*kardia*). These two verses (Heb. 4:12 and Mark 12:10) taken together would make man a quintuple being. Besides, we have another New Testament word for mind (*nous*) and still another for the inner mind (*ennoia*). Thus man would be composed of some six or seven different subsistences — a doctrine that is neither probable nor reasonable.

(2) Some psychical terms, like soul (Greek, *psyche*) and spirit (Hebrew, *ruach*), are used interchangeably, as if they stood for the same entity. In Eccl. 12:7 we read of the

spirit (*ruach*) returning to God, and in Matt. 10:28 our Lord speaks of those foes of man who are able to kill the body, but not the soul (*psyche*). It is significant that Christ seems always to treat man as a dual, not as tripple, being (Matt. 12:28; 16:25, 26; Mark 8:35-37). In the last two passages the word for soul (*psyche*) is used throughout, even in Mark 8:35: "For whosoever will save his *soul* shall lose it," etc. (The Greek word for *life* is not used in this verse).

(3) From his creation and fashioning (Gen. 1:27; 2:7) man seems to be treated in the Bible as a twofold being, composed of material and psychical substances—body and soul.

(4) The best interpretation of the various psychical terms used in the Bible seems to be to regard them as different aspects and activities of the same mental entity, just as the corporeal part of man is sometimes called flesh (*sarx*) and sometimes body (*soma*). This exposition might be tabulated in this way:

Soul (*nephesh*): The mind in its relation to man's physical life (Gen. 2:7).

Soul (*psyche*): The mind as the deathless, imperishable part of man (Matt. 10:28).

Spirit (*ruach, pneuma*): The spiritual faculty or activity of the mind; the mind in its relation to God (Eccles. 12:7; 1 Thess. 5:23).

Heart (*kardia*): The emotional aspect of the soul.

Mind (*nous, dianoia*): The intellectual, perceiving, reasoning power of the mind.³

3. For an additional discussion on this point see Addendum III, near the end of this volume.

CHAPTER III

IV. PSYCHICAL TERMS IN THE BIBLE.

1. THE BODY.

Of course, we do not here treat the body as a mere anatomical structure or a physiological functioning organism, but as an instrument and habitat of the mind. It is often treated thus in the Holy Scriptures.

In Dan. 7:15 we read: "I, Daniel, was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me." Here the body seems to be regarded as a kind of sheath (*nidneh*) for the spirit (*ruach*). The word "head" is also here used to denote the instrument of the mind, just as we say, "I think with my brain," using the term "brain" as the instrumental ablative. We also say, "I think with my head."

2 Cor. 5:1: "For we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Here the body seems to be regarded as a house or tabernacle for the soul; for the rest of the verse connotes the continuance of self-conscious personality in a higher, happier and eternal environment.

1 Cor. 6:19: "What? Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost who is in you, which ye have of God?" The plain implication here is that the Holy Spirit dwells with the self-conscious soul, and therefore also dwells in the body. The body obviously is surcharged with men-

tality. What a distinction, according to Christian teaching, therefore, is conferred upon man's physical organism!

The body is also to be presented as "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God," and this sacrifice is called "your rational service" (Romans 12:1). This means that the self-conscious mind must use the body in divine service. Afterward Paul says, "Be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." Both mind and body belong to God, and should be devoted to Him in complete consecration.

It is significant that the body in its natural state is called by Paul the psychical (*psuchicos*) body; while after the resurrection, it will be a spiritual (*pneumaticos*) body (1 Cor. 15:44). In the present life the body is under the control of the natural mind, which is always more or less sinful; whereas in the resurrected life the body will be ruled entirely by the highest—that is, the spiritual—powers of the mind.

Nowhere in the Bible, as far as we can recall, is the body (*soma*), represented as evil *per se*, as Plato and the Gnostics taught; yet men are enjoined to "keep the body under" (1 Cor. 9:27); also to "put an end to the evil habits of the body" (Rom. 8:13 translation of the *Twentieth Century New Testament*).

2. THE FLESH.

(1) Hebrew, *basar*: a. The soft tissues of the body; b. All fleshly creatures: "The end of all flesh is come before me" (Gen. 6:13; also 7:21; Lev. 17:14; Num. 16:22).

(2) Greek, *sark*: a. The soft tissues of the body: "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me have" (Luke 24:39); b. The body itself: "The spirit indeed is willing,

but the flesh is weak" (Matt. 26:41); c. All humanity: "There should no flesh be saved" (Mark 13:20); d. Human nature without sin: "And the Word became flesh" (John 1:14); e. Sinful human nature: "Make no provision for the flesh;" "Flesh and blood cannot enter the kingdom of heaven;" "Walk not after the flesh;" "The flesh lusteth against the spirit;" "The mind of the flesh is enmity against God."

3. THE SPIRIT.

(1) Hebrew, *ruach*: a. Used to express the divine nature, or perhaps to suggest the third person of the Trinity (*Ruach Elohim*; Gen. 1:2; 6:3; Isa. 61:1; Ps. 139:7); b. Used to designate man's mind (Eccles. 12:7; Job 32:8; Ps. 61:10; Prov. 16:2); c. Often used for an inclination, temper or disposition (Josh. 5:1; Isa. 57:15).

(2) Greek, *pneuma*: Refers to the Holy Spirit (Mark 1:10; Luke 2:27; John 3:5, 35; Acts 2:4); designates man's mind in many places; describes a temper or disposition: "Go in the spirit and power of Elijah" (Luke 1:17); "the spirit of wisdom and revelation" (Eph. 1:17).

4. THE SOUL.

(1) Hebrew, *nephesh*: a. The whole psychical nature of man, as in his creation (Gen. 2:7: "man became a living soul;" "my soul longeth for the living God;") b. The whole human personality: "All souls that were begotten."

(2) Greek, *psyche*: a. The whole mind: "not able to kill the soul;" b. The whole person: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers" (Rev. 13:1); c. The supremely important part of man, evidently his self-conscious mind: "What shall it profit a man to gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"

5. THE MIND.

(1) In the Hebrew: *Leb*, *Lebab* (heart); *nepesh* (soul); *ruach* (spirit). This means that these Hebrew nouns are sometimes translated “mind” in our English versions of the Bible, no doubt, where the sense and context require such translation.

(2) In the Greek: *Gnome* (opinion); *dianoia* (intellect); *ennoia* (inner mind); *noema* (thought); *nous* (mind); *phronema* (inclination); *psyche* (soul).

6. THE HEART.

(1) In Hebrew the outstanding word is *leb*; next, *lebab* and *libbah*.

(2) In the Greek, *kardia*. In most of the contexts in which this word is used it obviously points to the emotional part of man’s mentality, as: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart;” “Let not your heart be troubled;” “Singing and making melody in your heart.”

7. THE REINS.

It is somewhat surprising that the Bible should use this term in connection with mental operations. The term is usually thought to designate the kidneys (Hebrew, *kelayoth*; Greek, *nephros*). Biblical psychology was deep, and was thoroughly dualistic; therefore, it taught that the soul inhabited the whole body, and affected more or less directly all its parts, and was in turn affected by them. Recently we heard a specialist in psychology declare: “We teach that the mind dwells in and functions through the whole body.” If it did not, how could the will control certain muscles and nerves in the parts of the body which are remote from the brain? Try to crook your index finger or move your big toe, and see if you can perform the exploit!

So with the reins or kidneys. Said the Psalmist: "Examine me, O Lord, and prove me; try my reins and my heart" (Ps. 26:2). A distress in the kidneys would certainly carry its message (stimulus) to the mind, and call for prayer on the part of a spiritually minded man.

Let us also note Prov. 23:15, 16: "My son, if thine heart be wise, my heart shall rejoice, even mine; yea, my reins shall rejoice when thy lips speak right things." No doubt the normal and healthy action of more or less obscure organs of the body like the kidneys will enhance the joy of the heart, while all parts of the body are apt to be favorably affected by a joyful mood of the mind.

If the word "reins" really refers to the kidneys, it is somewhat remarkable that the ancient Hebrews knew so much about the status and functions of such obscure organs. They must have been wise beyond their day. Some of us must admit that we have never been definitely aware of our kidneys, and would scarcely know that we possessed such organs if we had not studied anatomy and physiology.

The writer is rather inclined to the belief that the Hebrew writers have reference to bodily organs that are more prominent, although he can offer no exegetical reasons for his opinion. The Biblical references would certainly indicate that the reins were something very inner. Note this, "All the churches shall know that I am He which searcheth the reins and the hearts: and I will give every one of you according to your works" (Rev. 2:23). It does seem that here and elsewhere the term "reins" has a distinctly *psychical* meaning, and can hardly refer to the kidneys.

8. THE WILL.

The commonest Hebrew term for the Will is *ratson*, and the commonest Greek term is *thelema*. Both mean the power

of freedom of choice. Nowhere in the Scriptures is man either called an automaton, or treated as if he were one. Everywhere he is represented as a free and responsible being within the range of his knowledge and ability.

9. SUMMARY.

Let us now sum up the conclusions to which our study of Biblical psychical terms has led us, showing that the Bible gives us much material for our science, and is a book pervaded by a distinctly psychical element, and that of the highest qualitative importance.

(1) *Soma*: the house of the soul and the temple of the Holy Spirit; seldom, if ever, regarded as the seat of evil.

(2) *Sarx*: a. Human nature *per se*, used in the good sense; b. carnal human nature, including the whole man in his natural and sinful state.

(3) *Nephesh* and *Psyche*: the soul; sometimes the mind in its relation to the body; at other times the immortal part of man.

(4) *Ruach* and *Pneuma*: The mind in its relation to God and other spiritual realities.

(5) *Nous* and *Dianoia*: The mind in its intellectual aspects.

(6) *Leb*, *Lebab*, *Libbah* and *Kardia*: The emotional aspect of the mind.

(7) *Kelayoth* (the reins): A very inner, motivating aspect of the mind; exact meaning uncertain.

(8) *Ratson* and *Thelema*: the mind viewed as to its volitional or conative powers and activities.

Having studied the psychical terminology of Christianity's Source Book, we are now prepared to investigate the Biblical doctrine of man as a mental being — a study that ought to be of decided interest.

CHAPTER IV

V. BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF MAN AS A PSYCHICAL BEING.

1. THEOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY.

Christian Theology and Christian Psychology dwell together in entire amity. No schism exists between them. They are companion sciences, and he who masters one should master the other, in order that he may see how beautifully God has joined them together. In all sciences the total facts must be taken into consideration, so that we may obtain a whole view, and thus avoid one-sided and *ex parte* theories. Students who hold that theology and psychology are hostile to each other prove, *ipso facto*, that they have slighted the proper investigation of the one or the other, if not of both.

In psychology we simply view the Christian teaching from the standpoint of mental facts and activities; in theology we view them from the divine standpoint. As God has created the soul in His own likeness, His dealing with man must be in harmony with man's mental constitution. Thus God operates upon the soul of man according to the laws which He Himself has ordained for its control, discipline and redemption. When God sends stimuli of a moral and spiritual order into the mind, the mind is so constituted that it is able to respond and react to them. Here, then, is the meeting place of Theology and Psychology. In brief, all true sciences are divinely ordained, and hence constitute an accordant sisterhood.

2. MAN'S PSYCHICAL NATURE.

(1) *Man's Mind Created.*

As has been said, the Holy Scriptures teach explicitly that man's mind was divinely created (*creatio ex nihilo*), so that the primeval human being was personal and rational from the start. Hence he was a distinctly psychical personality, not a mere creature with animal instincts. He was placed in a garden, not in a jungle, and was given intelligent dominion over nature's domain and its animal denizens, and was subsequently treated as if he were psychically related to his Maker.

In the Hebrew, as has been previously said in this treatise, the verbs *asah* and *bara* are used to designate the manner of man's coming into existence (Gen. 1:26, 27). They mean respectively to *make* and to *create*, the latter term being more definitive as to method than the former; that is, the term *create* defines specifically the method of the *making*.

Neither of these terms connotes the idea of an age-long growth or development. To convey that conception the inspired writer should have used the correct Hebrew verb, such as *gadal*, *dagah*, *yatsa*, or, best of all, *tsamach*. In the whole Bible there is not the remotest hint or suggestion that man was evolved from an animal ancestry. Indeed, the total impression of Biblical teaching is that man was created to be *man* and nothing else, and that animals were created to be *animals* and never anything else.

It is much to the credit of Christianity's Source Book that its teaching is so clear and inspiring in respect to the origin and status of man; and also that it represents the natural realm as an orderly and graded system, and not a welter, flux and mix-up of types and species, with no definitely

marked *differentiae*. Fixity of type spells order; transmutation of type would spell chaos and uncertainty.

(2) *The Human Mind's Potentialities.*

According to Biblical teaching, the human mind was created with its various faculties (functioning powers, capacities, energies), *in potentia*, not in fully developed form. This is evident on the face of the Genesis narrative; for immediately after the creation of the first human pair, God proceeded to give them needed instruction as to their conduct (Gen. 1: 28-30); which proves that they were not created with complete knowledge from the start, as some perverters of Biblical teaching have charged. No orthodox believer has ever thought or taught for a moment that Adam and Eve were "walking encyclopedias," and no Christian theologian has ever proposed so puerile a doctrine. Some men have formed the habit of caricaturing Biblical and orthodox teaching, and thus attempting to create a laugh at it.

As we know in our study of the human mind today, it possesses innate powers (although perhaps not innate ideas). It was originally constituted with the power to respond to proper stimuli from without and within; hence it was from the beginning capable of development in knowledge and potency.

(3) *The Divine Image in Man.*

This refers to man's mind, not to his body, for nowhere in the Bible is the doctrine taught that God has a corporeal organism. Christ Himself said, "God is a Spirit." The so-called *anthropomorphisms* of the Bible are easily understood as even primary Christian instructors have long taught; they are simply colloquial expressions which enable man the better to comprehend the character of God. The divine similitude in man may be analyzed in this way:

a. The *essential* image:

Man's mind is constituted of psychical essence, similar to the divine essence. There are only two essences of which we know anything, namely, matter and mind. God is mind (spirit); man's highest endowment is also mind; hence in its essence (substance, entity, subsistence) man's mind is a finite replica of the infinite God.

b. The *psychical* image:

Man's mind has the same kind of psychical powers as his Creator, only in a finite instead of an infinite degree. God has intellect: He knows; man likewise. God is a self-conscious Ego; so is man in a limited degree. God feels and will; man also in a finite degree possesses these mental powers. How clear it is that man was created in the divine similitude!

c. The *moral and spiritual* image:

Man was created holy or righteous—that is, in the moral and spiritual likeness of his Maker. This part of the divine image was not something afterward super-added, but was concreted in the very making of man. How these various parts of the divine image were affected by the fall of man will be dealt with in a subsequent section of this work.

(4) *Man's body fashioned.*

It is evident from Biblical teaching and likewise from human observation that the divine intention was that the mind of man should have a physical habitat and organ, so that he would fit into his natural environment and not be a misfit or an alien therein. So God fashioned a body as an organ for man's soul. How did He bring it into existence?

According to the explicit teaching of the Bible, He fashioned it directly from the finest and most excellent material

(aphar) of the soil, just as today man's body comes ultimately from the substance of the soil and is composed of the same chemical constituents.

In his narrative of the construction of man's body the Biblical writer used the verb *yatsar*, meaning to fashion, mold, form, not to grow or develop (Gen. 2:7). He seems to have purposely avoided the use of any Hebrew verbs conveying the idea of development or evolution, such as *dagah* and *tsamach*.

It is no less significant of his intentional and precise use of verbs that he did not here use the verb *bara*, which means to create, because man's body was not created *ex nihilo* at this time, but was fashioned out of material that had been previously created, as described in Genesis 1:1. Who guided the Biblical writer? The wonderful adaptation of the human body to the uses of the human mind, and its power of reaction to the stimuli of man's natural environment, surely indicate intelligence and intentionality on the part of his Maker.

(5) Body and mind organically joined.

They were created and formed to be companions, to co-operate. Their partnership in life as we know it goes to confirm the Biblical doctrine. Here are Dualism and Interaction plain and simple; not Monism or Parallelism, as will be shown in a subsequent section.

(6) Man's disobedience and fall.

Something has gone wrong with man. This is self-evident, and is known even without the revelation given in the Bible. All nations and tribes recognize that man is not in a holy, happy and normal status. He is a sinner. His conscience tells him so, and his sacrifices to God or the gods corroborate the testimony of his conscience.

The Bible tells us how this misfortune occurred. It came through man's first disobedience. Now, what is the psychology of sin, according to the Christian conception (which is also the only true conception)? Sin is primarily a *psychical* act or movement, involving the self-action of the will. Sin must have come into the world through the wrong choice of a free moral agent, else it would not *be* sin—that is, moral evil involving guilt and blame on the part of the actor.

Every one ought to be able to see that, if there is culpability for a wrong status or act, there must be freedom or the power of choice. Why does man's conscience upbraid him for wrong-doing, if he is in the grip of necessity? How unjust it would be for God or human government to punish the sinner and the criminal if he can truly say, "I couldn't help it!" But the universal human consciousness and conscience are arrayed against the crude deterministic view of the human will.

So the Biblical account of the fall of man stands in its own right and is based on empirical principles. The first sin had its inception in the minds of the progenitors of the human genus. Doubt of God's wisdom and justice was first injected by the arch-tempter into their minds, and that was a psychical, not a physical, movement and experience. Then bodily desire was awakened, because the woman "saw that the tree was good for food." While this second step in the series was partly physical, yet it had its direct connection with the psychical, for the self-conscious mind must have been there to imagine and anticipate the gratification of the palate.

The next stage was about equally divided between the physical and psychical, for the woman saw that the tree was "pleasant to the eyes." This step might be designated as physico-psychical.

Next, the woman saw that the fruit of the inhibited tree "was to be desired to make one wise." This appeal was almost wholly to the psychical part of her being. Thus the first temptation and the consequent disobedience were both generic and genetic, involving potentially all the varied elements of human sin as we know it today and as it has exhibited itself throughout human history. All sin has in some ratio or other these elements. In principle the Second Adam, our Lord Jesus Christ, passed through the same trinal ordeal in the wilderness, on the pinnacle of the temple, and on the mountain top, when He was tempted of the devil. An apostle describes sin generically in its threefold aspect: "The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life" (1 John 2:16).

In the primeval temptation, therefore, we find psychological Dualism and Interaction in clear terms, for that test involved both the mind and the body. For this reason a tree, good for food and attractive to the esthetic faculty, was selected as the means through which the ordeal was presented to man's power of choice. Biblical teaching is all-sided.

It is clear, too, both psychologically and ethically, that a properly constituted situation as a test had to be arranged; for man's free moral agency would have been a useless appendage had it had no opportunity to exercise itself. So the Biblical doctrine of the fall of man, when once revealed, can be vindicated at the bar of reason.

(7) *Effects of the fall.*

a. The *essential* image remained intact: the essence of man's mind was not destroyed. We know this to be a fact because Adam and Eve still possessed their mentality, and so have their posterity possessed mentality ever since. As

far as science knows, the essence of no entity is ever destroyed in the sense of being annihilated; so with matter, so with mind.

b. The *psychical* image, however, was sadly marred and impaired. Man knows that he cannot think as clearly as he ought to think. His self-consciousness suffers sadly from lack of perfect introspective insight. How poorly people know themselves! His emotions have been greatly corrupted. In many ways his will is under handicap, so that he often does the things he ought not to do, and the reverse.

Thus the psychical image, while not destroyed, was greatly impaired. Here General Psychology and Christian Psychology coalesce, for all people are more or less keenly aware that their minds many times do not function as they should. The experience of abnormality is practically universal in the human race.

c. The *spiritio-moral* image was destroyed by the fall: by his sin man so injured his spiritual powers that he can in nowise save himself from sin and restore himself to divine favor and fellowship. This is what is meant by the doctrine of man's complete spiritual inability.

In Christian theology this aspect of the divine image is called man's "original righteousness," which, having been completely lost, can be restored only by divine power and gracious intervention. True, man still has left what is known as a kind of "civil righteousness" (see the Augsburg Confession and the Formula of Concord), whereby he can do some things that are conventionally right, and be a law-abiding citizen of the State; but this is by no means the spiritual holiness which God requires. To put it psychologically, man's spiritual capacity became atrophied and inoperative through his disobedience.

Psychology, as well as other sciences, must recognize the solidarity of the race; also the facts of geneticism and heredity. We are all the offspring of the first human pair; hence it is vain to try to deny our heritage of natural depravity or congenital sin. Even the evolutionists accept the doctrine of heredity, only they teach that this burden of sinfulness in the human race is the vestige of concupiscence inherited by us from an animal pedigree. Christians hold, however, that animals are not sinful, and that therefore we could not inherit sinfulness from them. Sin is an heirloom from our first parents, who really committed moral evil (sin) by an act of the will, and thus corrupted humanity at its fountain head.

No good will come from finding fault with this regime. And why? Simply because, whether the Bible is true or not, all of us actually do inherit sinful propensities from our ancestry; and we must acknowledge it and put up with it. To find fault with God for permitting such an entail of depravation, and then turn round and advocate the presence of a thousand times' worse entail from an animal lineage, involving an age-long process, is certainly to reason very inconsistently. Psychology surely stands on firm ground when it teaches that moral evil in the race must have had its inception in the wrong choice of a human moral agent. This is also solid ethics and true Christian theology and anthropology, as well as sound psychology.

But it is cause for joy and gratitude that the Christian system does not leave man in the lurch after it depicts his lapse into sin; it does not leave him in a condition of hopeless misery and sin. It promises and offers help. This leads to our next thesis, which is one of paramount importance.

(8) *The Psychology of Salvation.*

Since man's *essential* image (his mind in its essence) still remains, and since his *psychical* image was not totally impaired by the fall, the Holy Spirit, by means of the Word of God, can still enter through psychological channels and by psychological methods into man's soul (*psyche*), and arouse and enable his dormant (or sinfully atrophied) spiritual powers, point him to Christ as his Redeemer, and thus start him in the way of the Order of Salvation (see a later section).

This awakening is not a mere development of man's natural powers; it is the beginning of a divine operation in restoring the soul to its normal status; it is the result of a supernatural intervention; the impartation of a new spiritual life and ability. Let us follow this theologicoo-psychological process somewhat in detail.

(9) *Psychology and the Atonement.*

a. What is the connection between human psychology and the expiation wrought by Christ for sinners through His passive obedience — that is, through His vicarious sufferings and death? The doctrine of the substitutional atonement is dealt with in treatises on Dogmatic Theology. Here we shall try to show how the Biblical doctrine fits into man's mental structure.

b. First, it makes a strong appeal to man's *emotional* nature; not, of course, to a low order of emotions, but to the highest and best within him. If it is true that the Father "so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son" in infinite sacrifice for its redemption, that fact ought to stir love and gratitude in the sinner's heart as soon as it is made known. If it is true, as the Scriptures teach, that the Son came into the realm of time and space, became in-

carnate in human form, "emptied Himself" (Phil. 2:8; *ekenosen*), "became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross," "tasted death for every man," and took upon Himself the penalty due to sinful men—if all these are facts, who would not be moved and melted to repentance, gratitude and love by this display of sacrificial love on the part of the Triune God? Such love always touches the better emotions. A parent's sacrifice for his children makes a most winsome appeal to the heart. Even the sacrifice of a mother robin in allowing herself to be burned to death in an effort to save her tender brood almost melts us to tears.

No doubt more people have been won to Christ by the "old, old story of Jesus and His love" than by any other means. While the minatory teachings of Christ and the Bible are needed, and should not be relegated to a negligible place; yet it has ever been the self-abnegating love of the Redeemer that has been most winsome and effective. Note the appealing character of a statement like this: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 John 4:10); or this: "We love, because He first loved us" (1 John 4:19). The words of Paul are both pathetically reproachful and engaging: "Or despisest thou the riches of His goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance" (Rom. 2:4)?

Thus we see that the fact of the vicarious atonement fits into man's mental constitution so far as regards his emotions. But let it be remembered that if Christ was not true God, and did not really suffer the condign punishment due to us, thus taking our place before the law and saving us from dire doom, then God *did not truly love us*; for He was

not willing to sacrifice Himself in our behalf; then, woe are we! He let one of His finite creatures suffer on the cross a martyr's death, but was Himself unwilling to endure suffering for us. Such a God could not win us to repentance, gratitude and love. Much more winsome is the Biblical teaching: "But God commendeth His love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8); "For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45); "I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep" (John 10:11).

c. Moreover, the Christian doctrine of atonement appeals also to man's *ethical* and *intellectual* nature, to his rational mind; especially if he is able and willing to think on the higher ethical and spiritual levels and not merely on the vegetative and sensory plane. Let us see.

It is a glorious fact that the plan of redemption through Christ has its ultimate source (*Ursprung*) in the love of the Triune God (1 John 3:16; 1 John 4:9, 10)—a fact that certainly appeals to man's reason as well as to his emotion. Yet love, even divine love, must act in accord with ethical principles. If it should violate them, it would be mere sentimental love, not holy love.

Now, we find in God and in the government of the world another ethical principle besides love—the principle of justice, which has the same divine and eternal source. If a moral agent sins against that principle, he must suffer condign punishment, else the principle would become useless, abortive and inoperative, and violence and anarchy would dominate and ruin the universe. Therefore, God could not be righteous and at the same time wave aside an eternal ethical law and forgive and save man, the sinner, by a mere arbitrary fiat. What would become of His moral government if He did?

Now, this is precisely the meaning and purpose of the atonement for sin which was wrought by the sufferings and death of the incarnate Son of God. He, who was the ground and source of the moral law, "humbled Himself to be born of a virgin," to become truly human, to be "born under the law," that He might suffer as a human being under the law, and thus might redeem them that are under the law, and give them the adoption of sons, free from the law's condemnation. In this way the eternal Son of God could endure the penalty due to the sinning children of men, and thus uphold the principle of eternal justice and the moral government of the world.

This principle of substitutional atonement is taught in many places in the Bible (note the following: Isa. 53:4-8, 11, 12; Matt. 29, 28; Rom. 5:6-10, 18, 19; 6:10; Gal. 3:13; 1 Pet. 3:18; Heb. 7:27; 9:28; 10:10). Let us quote a few relevant texts: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit; for the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death; for what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Rom. 8:1-4); "To declare, I say, at this time His righteousness; that He might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus" (Rom. 3:26); "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God" (1 Pet. 3:18); "For God hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Cor. 5:21).

For a fuller development of this doctrine of atoning mercy and grace consult any evangelical treatise on Christian theology.¹ Our point here is, that the Biblical doctrine is psychologically justified by its persuasive appeal to both the intellect and the emotions, and thereby stirs the conscience to contrition, begets the ability of faith, and spurs and energizes the will into the right kind of action.

(10) *Psychical Aspects of the Order of Salvation.*

a. *The awakening of man's spiritual powers.*

In theology this movement of the Holy Spirit in the divine order is called *vocation*. The theology of the process is that God calls the sinner to repentance and salvation. Its psychology is that, while man's spiritual powers are atrophied by sin both inherited and actual, they still have not been destroyed, but are capable of being stirred into life and activity. That is, he who is "dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. 3:1) is capable of being awakened to his sad and perilous condition; for the Word says: "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ will give thee light." Thus theology and psychology meet and integrate in the very first stage of this sacred and progressive movement of the Holy Spirit's operations.

b. *Legal enlightenment.*

In theology the next step in the series is called *Legal Illumination*. When the mind is awakened in a spiritual way, it is not left in total darkness. The Holy Spirit through the law of God enlightens the mind in respect to its sinful

1. See Jacobs, *A Summary of the Christian Faith*; Lindberg, *Christian Dogmatics*; Hodge, *Outlines of Theology*; Stalker, *The Atonement*; Mozley, *The Doctrine of the Atonement*; Mabie, *The Divine Reason of the Cross*; Mullins, *The Christian Religion in its Doctrinal Expression*; Forsyth, *The Cruciality of the Cross*; Remensnyder, *The Atonement and Modern Thought*.

condition; "for by the law is the knowledge of sin" (Rom. 3:20); "I had not known sin but by the law" (Rom. 7:7).

Now, the mind is so constituted that, when it has been spiritually awakened and the holy law of God is announced to it, the conscience is touched and impressed and stirred into conscious activity, and thus contrition and repentance are effected (provided the work of the Spirit is not checked by the stubborn human will); a sense of helplessness is created, perhaps even of temporary despair in some cases of keen conviction.

c. *Evangelical Enlightenment.*

In theology the next stage of the movement is known as *Evangelical Illumination*. This means that when the sinner has become conscious of his sinful and helpless condition, God does not leave him in despair, but illuminates him by the gospel, offering him grace and help in Christ, thus begetting passivity, or passive faith, or the willingness to let God regenerate and save him. What he feels he can in nowise do by and for himself, that he permits Christ to do for him. Then comes the next movement of the Holy Spirit.

d. *Regeneration, or the New Birth.*

This means the begetting of a new spiritual life in the soul of man, making him "a new creature in Christ Jesus" (2 Cor. 5:17). It is a divine operation, accomplished by the Holy Spirit through the Word of God. On its theological side it is the work of God; but its psychology may be set forth on this wise: The Word of God, accompanied by the Holy Spirit's power, comes into the mind through the ordained psychological channels, usually through the optical and auditory apparatus. Unless there is resistance on the part of the sinner (who has been previously awakened and illumined), his mind has become receptive of the

Spirit's gift of grace, and thus regeneration, or the new spiritual enablement, is effected.

Moreover, the ability of active faith is also begotten whereby the soul lays hold on Christ as the Saviour. As soon as the soul accepts the atoning work of the Redeemer, God justifies and pardons the sinner by imputing to him all the gracious redemptive work which Christ wrought in his behalf. Justification is solely God's work, but it is pronounced on the condition of faith on the regenerated sinner's part. Regeneration is also solely God's work, but it is done within the sinner's soul. Here once more we discern an accordant meeting place of Christian Theology and Psychology.

Note: Regeneration is accomplished *within* the sinner on condition of passive or purely receptive faith. Justification is pronounced *for* the sinner on condition of active faith. But there is still more psychology to follow.

e. *The Witness of the Spirit.*

No sooner has this gracious divine work been done within and for the penitent and believing sinner than the Holy Spirit bears witness in his consciousness that he is justified and saved. It is not reasonable to suppose that God would justify, pardon and regenerate a person without imparting to his conscious ego the glorious fact. Hence we read: "The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ, if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may also be glorified together" (Rom. 8: 16-17; cf. 5:1; 8:1). Theology and psychology are again co-operative.

f. *Conversion.*

In its broadest sense, this term (*con*, with, and *erto*, to

turn) includes the whole process up to this point, and therefore means the work of God whereby He turns the sinner from sin to righteousness, from spiritual darkness to spiritual light, and from the power of Satan unto God.

g. *Sanctification.*

Sanctification is another combination of theological and psychological activities, and may be defined as a progressive process—that is, growth in grace and holiness through the co-operation of the will of God and the regenerated will of man.

(11) *Psychology of Christian Experience.*

In all frankness it must be said that a number of writers on the psychology of religious experience are one-sided and ineffective. Any attempt to explain Christian experience in its totality on the ground of mere natural psychology is bound to be a failure, for mere mental facts and activities cannot account for all the phenomena. Without the proper co-ordination of the theological and the psychological elements involved, such an experience cannot be adequately explained. Eliminate or ignore the supernatural factor, and your attempted explanation is left hanging in the air. The so-called subconscious mind has not within it the elements to furnish all the data of a true Christian assurance of truth and salvation.

A candid analysis of the contents of such an experience will, we believe, establish our proposition. What are those elements? Of course, they will vary in some of the details according to the previous status of the subject; but in the broad fundamental facts they will be seen to be alike in all cases. We shall note some of the variations, and also the elements that are permanent and are shared by all who receive Christian conversion.

a. An assurance of the divine existence.

If the subject has previously been an agnostic or an atheist, he will receive in his conversion the inner witness that God exists and that He is gracious to those who come to Him in penitence and faith. The writer has witnessed the conversion of more than one agnostic, and in every case he not only came to know that there is a God, but also became an enthusiastic witness to, and advocate of, the theistic world-view. He also found great joy in the discovery that there is a good and loving God who is the Creator, Preserver and Redeemer of the world. The best—perhaps the only—cure for chronic atheism is a true Christian conversion bringing an experience of God to the soul.

Moreover, this change always produces a salutary and improving effect on the ethical life of the subject. Before his conversion the unbeliever may have lived a conventionally moral life, and may have done many things that are right *per se* and in accordance with the moral standards; but after his conversion he has a heightened conception of the ethical life, and is much more sensitive to right and wrong than he was before. Many thoughts and acts that he previously felt were without sin he now deletes from his life. The whole complement of duties to God, which he had previously rejected, now becomes a paramount obligation and privilege, and he realizes that the Bible is fundamentally right and ethically profound when it teaches that love for God comes first and then love for one's fellowman.

Now, these data of a Christian experience cannot be explained merely on the basis of natural or behavioristic psychology. They are not mere "upgushings of the rich content of the subconscious mind," as a liberalist phrased it some time ago. No; such a content was not there; so it could not have gushed up, or come up in any other way.

More than that, unbelief had possession of the consciousness, and therefore could not have given rise to its very opposite, namely, belief in God and certitude regarding His existence and love.

The only adequate explanation of all the phenomena in such a spiritual transformation is the combination of the theology and psychology—that is, that God, by His Spirit through His Word, produces the change (theology); then that the human soul is so constituted that it can receive the impact of the Holy Spirit upon its consciousness, and thus recognize its reality, just as it functions when some other stimulus comes to the same center, that of the self-conscious self. If man has a receptivity for assurance of truth regarding other matters, there is no reason, psychological, or logical, or otherwise, why he should not have such a receptivity in spiritual matters.

Our thesis here is in agreement with the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, for we read: "If ye continue in my Word, then shall ye be my disciples indeed; and ye shall *know* the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (Matt. 8:31, 32). Note: the mind has the capacity to recognize truth as truth when it makes its impingement upon the conscious self.

b. *The assurance of pardon.*

Whether the subject has previously been an unbeliever or not, a distinctive factor in his new experience is the sense that God has pardoned his sins. It is almost as if he heard the voice of Jesus in his soul, saying, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee" (Matt. 9:2). This experience is witnessed to by hundreds of thousands of Christians, whose testimony cannot be successfully impeached by persons who have never known such an experience or even tried to obtain it.

Now, how could this inner assurance of pardon be explained by the theory of a psychological "upgushing," or in any other naturalistic way? What is there about the human mind that, having become convicted of sin through the teaching of the moral law, it should, on condition of repentance, realize and experience such a personal act as that of pardon, and then attribute it to the personal love of a forgiving and merciful God? If the mind deceives people in such matters, then it must be a most illogical and unreliable entity.

Again, if there is nothing but material substance in the world and in the nature of man, how could it ever give men the consciousness of God and His forgiving mercy? Strange exploits, indeed, are performed by the matter of the materialists! When a man receives the assurance that God has pardoned his transgressions, he begins to live a better life. That fact cannot be accounted for on the basis of mere naturalism, which regards the experience as a delusion. It is most marvelous what delusions material substance imposes on the human mind—if there is no existent entity but material substance!

c. *The certitude of adoption.*

Another factor of Christian experience is the assurance of adoption into the divine family. The apostle puts it: "The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16). Another apostle says: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God" (1 John 3:2). The newly converted person calls God Father now and henceforth. The Spirit within him leads him to cry, "Abba, Father" (Gal. 4:6).

Now surely so personal a relationship to God can be explained only on the assumption that the supreme Being is

real, and therefore is able to impart the blessed assurance to the receptive soul. Material substance could never produce such an experience; even if it could, why should it do so? Nor could such an assurance be self-induced, and thus fool the subject into the belief that it came from God Himself. Every effect must have both an adequate and a consistent cause.

d. *The assurance of truth in Christ.*

One of the clearest factors of a Christian experience is that Christ verifies Himself to and in the soul as being "the way, the truth and the life." The author has never known a conversion to take place in which this element was not present and conspicuous. The experience is always attributed to Christ by the subject himself. He gives the praise to Christ. He never for a moment is conscious that the experience came up merely from the potentialities of his own mind. Why does he give Christ the glory if Christ does not produce the experience? What kind of a mind must man have, anyway, that it would deceive him in so important a matter? Can an experience that so transfigures his life and so enriches his soul be merely an hallucination? It is hardly reasonable to believe it.

A much more reasonable explanation is the following: "If any man willeth to do His will, he shall *know* of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself" (John 7:17). Christ is willing to be tested, and when the test is made, He gives the assurance of truth. The conviction that Christ is the Messiah, the Redeemer of the world, is an outstanding fact and factor of a Christian experience.

e. *The assurance that the Bible is God's Word.*

Another component part of a thoroughgoing Christian

experience is the conviction that the Bible is God's holy and authoritative revelation. However skeptical the convert may have been previously, this experience cures him of his unbelief.

Of course, not all the difficulties in the Bible are resolved for him at once; but he knows in a general way that the Bible is a divinely inspired volume, and so he is either prepared to accept the difficulties on faith, or, if he is inclined to engage in scholarly research, he will investigate the supposed difficulties, and will soon find that they either vanish altogether, or are reduced to a minimum. Perhaps he will reflect that, if the Bible were not a profound book, and if it did not present some difficulties, it would have been thoroughly mastered long ago, and so would have palled upon the human soul by its childish simplicity and mediocre character. The way of salvation itself is plain enough (*Isa. 35:8*); but along the way there are many profound and absorbing matters to investigate. This is evident from the very fact that more books are written in explication of the Bible than of any other book.

With no desire to judge anyone harshly, the writer feels that a real, heartfelt Christian experience is the sure cure for the rationalistic spirit, which accepts only such parts of the Bible as agree with human reason, and rejects the rest.

f. The assurance of salvation.

No part of a Christian experience is brought out in clearer relief to the consciousness of the converted person than the assurance of salvation. This assurance is precisely what the contrite and penitent sinner desires and needs. The sinner's emergency becomes God's opportunity. The Holy Spirit, therefore, according to the Word of God, witnesses to the soul that salvation has been conferred. This expe-

rience comes in agreement with the promises of the Bible, which say that "whosoever believeth shall not perish, but have everlasting life;" also, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved." "What shall I do to be saved?" cried the Philippian jailer. Paul and Silas replied: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house" (Acts 16: 30, 31). How can such an experience be explained save as the effect of a divine operation on the soul?

g. The assurance of the future life.

However it may be explained, the Christianly converted soul receives the assurance that it "is not all of life to live nor all of death to die." In observing many conversions and hearing the testimony of many more converted persons, we have never known an exception. Prior to his conversion a man may have been steeped in materialism, may have denied the reality of the soul, and hence may have flouted the possibility of the soul's continuance after the death of the body; but his views are wholly changed when Christ comes into his being.

After all, it is not difficult to explain: "He that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting life" (John 3: 36). Notice the verb "*hath*"—it is in the present tense. If through faith in Christ one receives everlasting life, it is reasonable to conclude that God will attest that fact to one's consciousness. It is also said of those who are "enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift," that they "have tasted of the good Word of God and the *powers of the world to come*" (Heb. 6: 4, 5). Man's soul, no doubt, is immortal by its very creation, but the consciousness of it may be lost through sin. That consciousness is restored by the experience of Christ, "who only hath immortality" (1 Tim. 6:16), and

"who hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel" (2 Tim. 1:10). See section (12) below.

h. *The blessed experiences that follow.*

Having analyzed the chief experimental contents of Christian conversion, we call attention to its transforming effects upon the life. The experience does not end with conversion, but continues to produce joy, peace and comfort. It changes the *morale* of the life, and affords grace and help in time of temptation. Contentment of the right kind is another result. It also begets love for God and for mankind. Thus we read as follows: "The fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control" (Gal. 5:22, 23).

i. *The conclusion.*

Examine the content of a Christian experience as above described. Note that the elements are of a *personal* character; all of them involve *personal relations*. Therefore they cannot be identified with a kind of general, indeterminate mysticism, such as certain pantheists affect to receive. Spinoza, sometimes called "the God-intoxicated man," never claimed to have experienced the forgiveness of sin, or the assurance of truth in Christ, or the joy of salvation, or the sense of God's Fatherhood. So likewise is the Hindu experience of *yoga*—union with God—self-induced by long-continued abstract thinking; by saying over and over again, "I am Brahm, I am Brahm;" but there is no claim that a personal God comes to the soul with comfort and pardon, and enters into *personal* union and communion with the Hindu ascetic.

Hence we conclude that Christian conversion is unique, is something peculiar to and distinctive of Christianity, and can be adequately accounted for only on the assumption

that it is a *bona fide* experience and that a supernatural Person operates upon the soul, which, in turn, has the constitutional ability to react and respond to the divine operation.

(12) *Psychology and Eschatology.*

a. The soul of man was constituted in its creation to be immortal. There are no peoples who do not accept some doctrine of a future life. This universal intuition and belief would seem to prove that man was created with the note of eternity ringing in his being, with its seal stamped upon it. It is not likely that insensate material substance, in the course of evolution, ever would or could have put into man's soul even the conception of immortality. What was matter about, anyway, to make almost all nations and tribes believe in a future state of conscious existence if such belief has no basis in fact? Surely this is a rational world. It is a cosmos, not a chaos.

b. After the death of the body the soul is enabled by the divine power to exist and functions self-consciously in a disembodied state. For those who are saved through faith in the person and redeeming work of Christ, it is a condition of blissful fellowship with God and "the spirits of just men made perfect."

In a previous section (Chapter II) we have shown the Biblical basis for this doctrine (in the section dealing with man's creation as a dual being). At this point we need to refer only briefly to the proof-texts: "The spirit returns to God who gave it" (Eccl. 12:7); "This night shall thy soul be required of thee" (Luke 12:20); The parable of the rich man and Lazarus, with the latter at rest in Abraham's bosom (Luke 16:19-31); "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23:45); John's vision of the souls of the

martyrs before the altar in the New Jerusalem (Rev. 6:9); Paul preferred "to depart and be with Christ" (Phil. 1:23, 24); He also speaks of being "absent from the body and present with the Lord" (2 Cor. 5:6-8).

As far as regards the teaching of General Psychology, it can say nothing save by inference in favor of a future state of the soul; neither can it offer any valid and convincing reasons against it. True, materialistic psychology may assert that there can be no thought or other mental action without the brain, the neurones, the ganglia, etc.; but materialism has too many facts against it to be accepted by the majority of the race.

Therefore, if the mind is a distinct entity, there is no good reason to think that it perishes, or ceases to function, after it has departed from the body.² Indeed, it is most reasonable to believe that rational beings like ourselves were created for something better and nobler than for a mere temporary existence on this mundane sphere, and then doomed to eternal oblivion. Such a view makes human life not only an insoluble, but a most distressing, mystery.

According to the Christian view, life and the universe have a purpose, one that is pre-eminently worth while. Then we need not write or read books on *The Riddle of the Universe*, but may rejoice in the thought that "all things work together for good to them that love God, to them that are the called according to His purpose" (Rom. 8:28). "For I reckon," says Paul again, "that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us" (Rom. 8:18).

Our own American poet, Longfellow, has put this doc-

2. Cf. J. B. Pratt, *Matter and Spirit*, pp. 226-230.

trine of futurity so aptly and so rhythmically that it ought to carry conviction to every mind:

"Life is real, life is earnest,
And the grave is not its goal;
'Dust thou art, to dust returnest,'
Was not spoken of the soul."

c. The restoration of the body is also a Christian doctrine which has its profound and impressive psychological aspects.

Since the soul and the body were originally created and fashioned together, and are so intimately associated as mates in this life, it follows rationally that man's redemption will not be complete until his body is resuscitated (resurrected) and brought back into living conjunction with the soul. Then man as a dual being will enter upon his immortal career in God's spiritual and material universes.

This is the Biblical view of man's destiny. It surely is most reasonable and attractive. It stimulates the best in man to cherish such a faith and hope, as the inspired writer teaches in rhetoric of classical beauty: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him: for we shall see Him as He is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as He is pure" (1 John 3:2,3). Another apostolical writer puts it no less eloquently: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who, according to His abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you" (1 Pet. 1:3,4).

Surely the doctrine of eternal annihilation could have no such a morally and spiritually uplifting influence upon human life.

PART III

CORRELATION OF BIBLICAL AND SCIENTIFIC PSYCHOLOGY

CHAPTER V

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

The author sincerely believes that the Bible and true science are in accord. Science and religion need have no fallout. The God of the Bible is everywhere represented as the God of nature and of human mentality. If the Bible is a divinely given book, then its teaching ought to agree with the facts that are met with elsewhere in God's world. Of course, this proposition remains to be proved, but we desire to bear our testimony here that it can be established and that it is true.

The Bible, however, does not and ought not to accord with all the speculations of human reason, which are so often found to be in error; but true science is not based on speculation; it is based on empiricism—that is, on observation and experience.

There are man-made theories of human psychology that are opposed to the psychological teaching of the Bible. The outstanding ones shall now be treated as briefly and effectively as we can, to see whether they have a factual and rational basis. If they can be shown to be wrong and inadequate, we may then logically turn to the Biblical teaching to see whether it agrees with the scientific findings.

II. THE ANTI-CHRISTIAN THEORIES.

1. MONISTIC PSYCHOLOGY.

The Bible, as we have seen, clearly teaches that man is a dual being, composed of body and mind. What about science? It has never been able to reduce mind and matter to one substance. In all its researches it must consider and treat them as belonging to different categories; as being different entities.

This is evident because different terms must be used in dealing with them, and in describing their activities. This fact will be developed more fully in a later section. The fiercest monist does not treat rational personalities as he treats inorganic substances or plants and animals. Nor does he act like them. Even when he writes a book in advocacy of his monistic doctrine, he uses his mind in a very psychical and purposive way. Would he be willing to admit that he did not write his book with a definite purpose in mind?

2. IDEALISTIC PSYCHOLOGY.

The Bible everywhere treats material substance and the material universe as if they were real; never as if they were illusions of the mind. So do scientists, whatever may be their speculations. Not one of them could conduct his investigations or even continue to exist, if he did not treat matter as a real substance. In the practical sense, therefore, every man is a dualist in philosophy, and therefore he must be a dualist in psychology, if he would live in a real world in a real and practical way.¹

1. For good works dealing with the Idealistic Philosophy see J. H. Ryan, *An Introduction to Philosophy*; E. S. Brightman, *An Introduction to Philosophy*; M. W. Calkins, *The Persistent Problems of Philosophy*; D. M. Edwards, *The Philosophy of Religion*. The author cannot agree with all the positions of some of these authors, but they do treat Idealism in an effective way.

It is not good for the psychologist, or any one else, to adopt a philosophy that is impractical and by which he cannot live his life truly in this world. Such a theory will make him dreamy and ineffective.

3. MATERIALISTIC PSYCHOLOGY.

This is simply another form of monism, holding the view that man is composed only of matter; that he has no mind as a real entity and as transcendent to the body. It is diametrically opposed to the teaching of the Bible, which always treats man as if his mind or soul were a real subsistence, not a mere phantasm or epi-phenomenon. Of course, the Bible also teaches clearly that the mind is vitally connected with the body as its physical organism during the present life.

Is materialism true? Can it be maintained at the bar of science and reason? We think not. Why? Because psychical facts can be thought of and dealt with only in psychical terms. Even the crassest materialist, if he is going to do any writing and speaking at all, must use such terms as self-consciousness, thinking, conscience, will, emotion, freedom—none of which terms can be properly applied to insensate material substance.

Let us note: Matter is not self-conscious; mind is. Matter cannot think, remember, reflect and reason; mind can and does. Matter has no sentiency; mind has. Matter cannot distinguish between right and wrong; mind does and can. Matter cannot choose between alternatives; mind can. Matter has no conception of God; mind has. Will not a little practical reasoning prove to all thinkers that matter and mind are different subsistences, made to co-operate in the human personality and life? It is impossible to account for mental being and phenomena on a merely materialistic

basis. It is impossible on the face of it for matter to have evolved into mind, for every effect must have an adequate cause. Therefore materialism and mechanism are non-suited at the bar of reason and science.

4. PARALLELISM.

This theory is dualistic, and thus far is true to facts and in harmony with the teaching of the Bible. But it errs in teaching that no causal interaction exists between the mind and the body; that they act independently of each other, and run, as it were, in two parallel lines. There is no causal connection, it holds, between bodily and mental states and activities.

This theory is hardly reasonable, for it is not probable that two entities would ever and always run along parallel lines if they were not connected in some way. Moreover, human experience everywhere agrees with the view that body and mind are so constituted that the one affects the other. Under the head of Dualism in a subsequent section we shall present the positive evidences for interaction.

5. THE DOUBLE ASPECT THEORY.

According to this view, mind and body are merely two faces or aspects of the same substance. Looked at in one way, it is mind; in another, it is matter.

But we may well ask what kind of an entity that would be which is neither mind nor matter, but a combination or coalescent of the two. This kind of monism is mere speculation. Such an entity as it assumes as its substrate was never known on sea or land or in the sky. The Biblical view of two co-operating entities, mind and body, agrees much better with actual observation and experience and is more in accord with reason.

6. BEHAVIORISM.

This theory, now somewhat popular, is also monistic, being practical materialism. Its advocates hold that muscular and bodily movements constitute the essence of mental activity.

The truth in it is that behavior—that is, bodily movement—is vitally connected with many of man's mental processes. Even the action of the muscles of the mouth and throat, of which behaviorists make so much, has a direct connection with the mind, affecting it in an important way, and being in turn more or less controlled by its thinking and volitional powers. The view which we are advocating in this treatise, that of Dualism and Interaction, by no means ignores or minimizes the importance of muscular and neurotic functioning and its effect upon the mind. While man is a solidarity as to the unity of his person, we as dualists recognize the fact that he is also a complex, made up of many components.

What are some of the faults of the behavioristic doctrine? It identifies or confuses mental actions with bodily functions, such as the play of the larynxial muscles. Because in talking men use the muscles of the larynx, therefore "thinking is only talking to oneself," as one of the proponents of this theory recently said.²

But such a view cannot be maintained in the court of reason and experience. It is impossible that mere muscular action should effect any kind of consciousness. Mere muscles do not know what they are doing, and certainly cannot produce thought, feeling and reason. These are purely mental activities, and therefore require as their basis an entity that belongs to a different category from that of merely material movement.

2. Professor George A. Dorsey in a recent book.

Suppose we consider the act of thinking. We can think for hours without any action of the muscles and nerves of the mouth and larynx—that is, the organs of speech. Then how can thinking be talking to ourselves? Now let us consider the act of talking. At once, when we decide to speak, by an effort of the will we bring the organs of speech into play and consciously use them in articulated language. We are careful to say just what we desire to say. We consciously frame our speech in correct grammatical forms, using sentences with subjects and predicates and various modifying terms to express our thought precisely, sometimes even to the finest shade. In all these mental activities there is vastly more than mere stomatic action; there is conscious mental effort. This fact agrees with experience. The behavioristic theory is contrary to experience, is suspended in the air, and is a matter of speculation, in the interest of the materialistic and mechanistic philosophy.

A most serious error of the behavioristic school is their denial of *personality* and *self-consciousness*, or at least their treatment of them as if they were negligible factors in human experience and action. In a recent work Professor J. B. Watson, the most outstanding advocate of Behaviorism (sometimes called the *infant terrible* of the theory), says that there may be such facts as self-consciousness and the self for aught he knows or cares, but he is not interested in them; he wants to get at muscular reflexes and responses. Thus he is not interested in pure psychology, in thinking in psychical terms, but only in the movements of the body.

In reply, we would ask what is the most outstanding item of human experience? Is it not that we are personal, self-conscious beings? The consciousness of the self is a universal experience. There is not a normal person in the

world who does not say "I" times without count; and the pronoun of the first person in all languages is the sign manual of self-conscious personality. Even the behaviorist uses the pronoun of the first person. In beginning a course of lectures, printed in a recently published volume, Dr. Watson says: "In this brief course of lectures *I* wish to talk about man," etc. In the next brief paragraph he uses the pronoun "I" five times. The last sentence is, "*I* shall present my thesis first."³

Thus it is evident that the behaviorist's theory is contrary to human experience in general and to his own experience in particular. We do not know of a professional psychologist who displays more consciousness of himself and his own place in the sun than does our friend, Professor John B. Watson. Yet in 1921 he wrote: "The time seems to have come when psychology must discard all reference to consciousness."⁴

We will now note what several psychologists have to say about Behaviorism. Says Professor Arthur O. Lovejoy:

"Behaviorism, in short, belongs to that class of theories which become absurd as soon as they become articulate . . . The behaviorist will certainly not deny that he 'observes' and thinks of things not contained within his own skin; he cannot take the first step in the formation of his account of the antecedents and determinants of bodily behavior without making this claim . . . And the awareness of the investigator, even of one investigator only, is sufficient to disprove the contention that no such phenomenon as awareness is to be found."⁵

3. See the book entitled, *Psychologies of 1925*, p. 1.

4. *The Monist*, April, 1921, p. 185.

5. *The Philosophical Review*, March, 1922, p. 141; quoted by J. W. Buckham, *Personality and Psychology*, p. 138.

To these strictures Professor Buckham adds the following trenchant remark: "The attempt to get rid of consciousness is like trying to escape from one's shadow; it can be done only by going into the dark."⁶ In all fairness we must add a qualification which Dr. Buckham makes. While Dr. Watson attempts to dispense with "consciousness, thought and motive," Dr. Buckham says: "I do not find these treated as castaways in Professor E. L. Thorndike's *The Original Nature of Man*, which is generally referred to as a behavioristic treatise. Such radicalism as that of Watson is not to be attributed to all forms of behaviorism."⁷

The following quotation from Dr. James B. Pratt puts the matter forcibly: ". . . The question of the existence of consciousness seems hardly arguable. It must be settled for each man by himself. Do you or do you not, the real question reads, find—actually find—within your experience such things as conscious pains and pleasures, conscious thought processes, conscious purposes—*conscious* ones, mind you—in the old-fashioned sense of the word and not to be identified with any physiological processes, no matter how subtle? For my own part I will hazard the guess that most of us assembled here would very emphatically say *Yes* to this question; that most of us find that *our thought* is of the old-fashioned conscious sort; although, if our behaviorist friends insist, it may be that courtesy will force us to accept their assertion that *their thinking*—the thinking by which they have arrived at such remarkable conclusions—is really nothing more than the unconscious activity of the language mechanism."⁸

6. Buckham, *op. cit.*, p. 138. This is a book of exceptional value.

7. Buckham, *op. cit.*, p. 138, footnote.

8. James Bissett Pratt, *Matter and Spirit*, pp. 128, 129.

Speaking of the behaviorist's denial of true thought processes, Dr. Pratt says: "He does, moreover, repeatedly make the distinction between bodily processes which are observed and those which escape observation—a distinction which is meaningless if observation consists in just the bodily processes themselves."⁹

We believe, therefore, that Behaviorism as an attempt to explain all psychical phenomena has been non-suited in the assize of experience and reason; and of course it differs fundamentally from Christian psychology, which ever regards the mind and the body as distinct, though inter-related, entities.

7. FREUDIANISM.

This school of psychologists lays too much stress on what they call "the sub-conscious mind." Thus they almost seem to divide the mind into two sections, the conscious and the sub-conscious (some prefer the term "unconscious"); whereas the mind should always be regarded as a unitary entity, functioning as a whole. Hence the term, "sub-conscious mind," is unfortunate.

However, the truth in this theory is that the mind possesses certain innate and sub-conscious *potentialities* which

9. *Ibid.* p. 126. Besides the works of Pratt, Lovejoy and Buckingham here cited, the following works are an excellent foil to the doctrines of Behaviorism: A. A. Roback, *Behaviorism and Psychology*; William McDougall, in *Psychologies of 1925*, pp. 273-305 (this volume comprises lectures by a number of eminent psychologists); Louis Berman, *The Religion Called Behaviorism* (see our note on this work in the Bibliography at the end of this volume); O. M. Norlie, *An Elementary Christian Psychology* (consult the index); Hervin U. Roop, *General Psychology* (consult index); G. A. Wilson, *The Self and Its World*, pp. 147-149, 290, 353; W. H. Johnson, *Does the Behaviorist Have a Mind?* (*The Princeton Theological Review*, March, 1927).

are capable of marvelous development, and may be brought out into clear consciousness by means of the necessary stimuli to which they react. Everybody is more or less aware of this evident, albeit mysterious, unfolding power of the human mind.

Moreover, many facts that were once known to the mind may be *stored away* and dwell in the sub-conscious mental capacity until some circumstance brings them back to consciousness. This holding power of the mind is known as *memory* or the recalling faculty.

Another fault of the Freudian psychology is its over-emphasis on sex passion, which it calls the *libido*. Almost every psychical experience is thought to be connected with and motivated by sexual desire. And this *libido* is not what is known in Christianity as pure conjugal love—that is, the psychical and physical affection which a true man and a true woman feel for each other, and which leads to Christian wedlock and the birth and rearing of children. Freudian *libido* is merely physical passion.

Thus this theory drags psychology down into the moral mire. The truth in it is that human beings do have the sex impulse, which must be recognized by individuals and society and controlled by the Christian moral sense and judgment. Christian marriage, which of course is monogamous, might be defined in this way: It is God's method of procreating the race without sin. There may be, as some one has put it, "a pure life for two"—that is, for one man and one woman who truly love each other and who are united in Christian and legal marriage. Promiscuity of sex leads inevitably to the destruction of the *morale* of a people and proves itself to be wrong by the terrible venereal diseases which follow in its wake.

Freudianism also includes what is known as psycho-analysis. While it has been extreme in this respect, there certainly is some value in the method, if sanely used, in ferreting out the hidden springs of mental action, and thus relieving people of certain morbid obsessions.¹⁰

It will be seen that Biblical psychology avoids all the errors, excrescences and extremes of the Freudian theory of mental action and experience. Besides, through the operations of divine grace in regeneration and sanctification, as has been shown in the preceding chapter, human passion may be brought under proper control.

8. THE EVOLUTION THEORY.

This widespread and popular theory holds (speaking psychologically) that the human mind is the outcome of an age-long process of development from the amoeba and other organic forms through animal instinct, until at last the human mind has been evolved.

However, the hypothesis still waits to be validated scientifically. Its advocates cannot point to a single concrete case of spontaneous generation, or transmutation of species, or the advancement of animals to the human status. Among all the varieties of vegetable and faunal species the doctrine of fixism seems to stand out most clearly. If it were not so, the realm of nature would be a welter and flux instead of a regime of order and law—a chaos instead of a cosmos. Try to think of a world in which one species were constantly running over into another! It would be a hodgepodge.

10. Good critiques and analyses of Freudianism are the following: Knight Dunlap, *Mysticism, Freudianism and Scientific Psychology*; J. W. Buckham, *Personality and Psychology*, pp. 144-157; A. E. Baker, *Psychoanalysis Explained and Criticised*; Hervin U. Roop, *General Psychology*, pp. 504-506.

Man could not live in such a regime, for he could not depend on the persistency of type.

That some species can be modified and improved by human effort and culture is self-evident, and this seems to be a providential arrangement for man's benefit. New species, however, are never produced, but only new and improved varieties, which, as soon as man ceases to keep them under culture, are subject to the law of reversion to type. If the whole human family were instantly destroyed, the natural realm would soon become a wilderness by virtue of its inherent tendency to hark back to the wild. It would not hold its present status, much less continue to advance into a higher condition. The obvious fact is that, when we look at nature with unbiased minds, and try to see her just as she is, she makes no progress of her own accord, but only under the intelligent care and manipulation of man.

The Biblical view of man's creation in the divine similitude is much better, much more rational and uplifting, and accounts much more adequately for all human experiences. It seems to us much more scientific to believe that the animals were created to *be* animals and to *remain* animals, and were endowed with sufficient instinct to live and function in their sphere; their instincts in some ways approaching human intelligence precisely in order that they might live and function. Then man was created (as to his mind) and fashioned (as to his body); but his mind, in addition to the natural instincts, was constituted a self-conscious, rational, moral and spiritual soul; thus he was able to live in the natural realm and at the same time hold communion with his Creator and Preserver. This view will certainly explain most adequately all the facts of both nature and man. It is especially a happy solution of the reason why man was

endued with those higher qualitative mental powers that form his chief distinction and value.¹¹

9. MOB PSYCHOLOGY.

That there is such a phase of mental possession no one should deny. It may be defined as the psychological seizure of a crowd in exciting circumstances and under the sway of an overmastering emotion. It is not the merging of individual minds, but a concert of individual thought and feeling moved by a single exciting idea or impulse.

However, the Christian experience of conversion is too individual to come under this class of mental action, as some skeptical persons are wont to assert. Often—and most frequently—the immediate experience does not occur in a crowd, but when the individual is alone with God and is in the calmest frame of mind. Besides, as we have seen in our previous analysis, the content of a true Christian experience is of such a personal character, and is made up of such highly ethical and spiritual elements, that it can be accounted for only on the basis of a supernatural impact upon the self-conscious soul. Crowd psychology is utterly ineffective as an explanation of such a transformation of character and life as that produced by true conversion.

It is true, some highly emotional religious movements may have in them too large an element of crowd psychology; but

11. For a somewhat extended attempt to vindicate the Biblical doctrine in contradiction from the evolutionary theory, see the author's *The Problem of Origins*. The following works on evolution are recommended: G. B. O'Toole, *The Case Against Evolution*; G. M. Price, *The Phantom of Organic Evolution* and *The New Geology*; C. B. McMullen, *The Logic of Evolution*; G. A. Zellers, *Reason and Evolution*; H. C. Morton, *The Bankruptcy of Evolution*; W. H. Johnson, *Can the Christian Now Believe in Evolution?* Many other effective works might be mentioned. The author will be glad to send a list to any address.

even here we would not want to speak with too much dogmatism, as it is not generous to play the role of a judge upon people's experiences.

The effects of social psychology—the *esprit de corps*—may be highly beneficial. If there were no such united movements, society would soon disintegrate from lack of unity of spirit and conduct. Voluntary concerted action for sane and righteous purposes is not to be traduced by the discrediting term, “mob psychology.”

10. SUGGESTION AND AUTO-SUGGESTION.

These terms in psychology have their use and contain not a little truth. All of us are more or less influenced by suggestions from other parties; this is part of our social outfit as we were originally constituted. Nothing could be learned in the home or the school if this were not so. All of us, too, are able to suggest thoughts and actions to ourselves. This is also a beneficial mental qualification.

However, it is one-sided to attribute all mental action and outward behavior to auto-suggestion and hetero-suggestion; they form simply a part of man's varied psychical life. Man's life is a complex, not a simple monad.

11. INCARCERATIONISM.

This long, jaw-breaking term means that the soul is a pure spirit imprisoned in a body, which is regarded as the seat and source of evil. The body is bad *per se*, according to this view.

This doctrine was held by Plato, who seems to have thought that the soul was imprisoned in a defiled body because of crimes it had committed in a pre-existent state. Some religious ascetics have held practically the same view, and have lived accordingly.

There is no Biblical basis for this doctrine. As we have seen, the body (*soma*) is never treated in the Christian system as evil in itself. It is rather looked upon as the habitat of the soul, as the temple of the Holy Spirit, as an instrument of reasonable service to God, and as finally, in its resurrected and glorified form, the immortal companion-piece of the redeemed soul. This Biblical view is most rational.

We have thus treated, at some length, what we regard as the wrong, or at least defective, views of man's psychical nature and activities. We hope we have been frank and open-minded enough to acknowledge the truth in these various conceptions, for nearly all of them have some truth that is worth while. The worst that can be said of them is that they are deficient and one-sided, and fail to take all the facts into consideration.

We shall now turn to the positive part of our argument, and shall endeavor to set forth what we regard as the true view—the one that coincides with the findings of scientific psychology, based on observation and experience. We shall also see, we think, that this scientific analysis agrees in all vital points with the teaching of Christianity's Source Book, the Bible.

CHAPTER VI

III. THE BIBLICAL AND SCIENTIFIC VIEW.

1. DUALISM.

Dualism is the view that the two entities, mind and body, having been created and fashioned for each other, are integrally united in one human personality. The true doctrine of Dualism includes the following:

2. INTERACTION.

This term in psychology means that the mind and body are so constituted and so intimately related that they act upon each other. On the one hand, the condition and functioning of the body and its organs affect the mind; on the other hand, the mind also acts upon and in many ways controls the body. This view agrees with numerous representations of the Bible, and especially with the narrative of the origin of the human family (Gen. 1:27; 2:7). It is stoutly upheld by a number of recent writers on psychology.¹

3. THE ARGUMENT FOR DUALISM.

In presenting this argument at some length, the author desires to make use of a considerable portion of an article

1. The following are worthy of mention: J. B. Pratt, *Matter and Spirit*; J. W. Buckham, *Personality and Psychology*; O. M. Norlie, *An Elementary Christian Psychology*; E. V. Crabb, *Psychology's Challenge to Christianity*; J. H. Snowden, *The Psychology of Religion*; W. E. Squires, *Psychological Foundations of Religious Education*; H. U. Roop, *General Psychology*. Professor Pratt presents a most convincing argumentation. In his preface he declares that he is willing to accept the appellation that has been applied to him: "An avowed dualist and unashamed."

entitled, "The Plus Sign in Modern Psychology," which he contributed to a well-known psychological journal.²

(1) *The Mind an Entity.*

The conception of the mind as an entity is sometimes girded at as "metaphysical." We cannot help pondering over such a statement. If by "metaphysical" is meant something *above* the physical order, as is indicated by the etymology of the term, the idea of the mind *is* a metaphysical conception, and rightly so; but if the term means, as is often conceived, something that is abstruse and difficult to grasp, then there are loads on loads of it in many of the works of the monistic and materialistic psychologists. It is surprising how many abstract terms are used by them, in spite of the fact that they profess to be teaching a concrete science. This is especially remarkable when we remember that much of the psychology of the day deals almost wholly with bodily functioning and very little with purely mental conceptions and activities. It seems to be more physiology than psychology.

If the mind as mind has no real existence—that is, if it is not a real entity—then why do we call it the *mind* at all? Why not use the correct materialistic nomenclature? For scientific folk that would be the only exact method. But if treating the mind as mind means to enter the field of philosophy, then, if philosophy is a discredited term, materialism does not escape the opprobrium of the term.

2. *The American Journal of Psychology*, March, 1928. The author acknowledges the kindness of the editors of this journal for the privilege of reprinting such portions of this article as are relevant to the present discussion. He also desires to say that he is thankful to the courteous editors of the said journal for giving him the privilege of presenting his thoughts to an audience of scientific psychologists.

(2) *Philosophy Unavoidable.*

We maintain that materialism is a philosophy even more so than is dualism, while the latter is more empirical than the former. Materialism is recognized as one of the three outstanding monistic systems of speculation, the other two being Idealism and Pantheism. Materialism says there is only one existent substance—matter. Idealism declares that the only entity is mind, the material universe being an illusion, a mere form of thought. Pantheism merges mind and matter into one substance, as, for example, Spinoza assumed but one substrate with the two attributes of extension and thought. The materialist attempts to interpret and explain the universe in terms of matter; and any attempt to do that is a philosophy.

(3) *The Term Psychology.*

The definition of psychology, until recently, has been "The science of the mind." Its etymology implies that definition—*psyche* and *logos*. The term *psyche* means the soul or the mind. Now, if there is no such an entity as the mind, the term psychology is a misnomer, and its use is injurious to the cause of science, because it constantly suggests to people's thought something that has no real existence. Some people want to define psychology merely as the scientific treatment of "experience." But experience carries a very different connotation from that of psychology. The latter deals with something concrete—an entity, the mind; the former is an abstract term; for if there is an experience, there must be a something that has had that experience; and, judged by all the laws of rational thought, that something must be conscious of its experience; otherwise an experience would be impossible. A stone or a block could not reasonably be said to have an experience.

Hence to try to explain psychical experiences in purely physical terms is to leave so large a plus sign as to give the impression that the major principle comes after and not before that sign. At least, the attempted physical explanation, in the present status of the case, is largely speculative, even more so than the assumption of a self-conscious agent known as the mind.

A confusion of thought occurred recently in a learned article. The author tried to explain the experience of fear on a purely subjective physical basis. He jibed at the usual explanation that the experience of fear arises from the appearance of a fearsome object, because, said the critic, that would be tantamount to saying that "you were afraid because you were afraid." Note the confusion of thought. The terrifying object is an objective reality, whereas the terror aroused is a subjective feeling. How can any one think so mistily as to fuse together an objective reality and a subjective experience? If a cross dog should suddenly appear before you and cause you sore affright, you surely would never afterward, in thinking over the adventure, say that the canine and your scare were one and the same thing. *Bene docet qui bene distinguit.*

(4) *A Physical Basis Inadequate.*

Now, to enter into the heart of the subject, the stupendous and all-important plus sign in much of modern psychology is this: On a purely physical basis, how can we account for the dominant fact and universal experience of self-consciousness? That is the primary and basic question. The second is like unto it: Without self-consciousness how can we have an experience? For without awareness we could have no knowledge of anything that occurs, whether it were an external event or an internal experience. Arcturus is a

very great star, but it does not know that it is sizable; it does not even know that it exists. But you and I are conscious of our existence and of myriads of other facts besides.

Hence there is a difference, *toto coelo*, between a self-conscious being and an insensate material object. A denial of this proposition is contrary to all experience, and hence does not belong to the sphere of scientific psychology, but to that of pure speculation and conjecture. Nothing can be proved before the bar of reason and science that does not come within the field of consciousness. Even the most radical behaviorist must be conscious of his attempt to convince the world of his theory. His very zeal is evidence that he is something more than a material monad.

Let us note a few of our experiences somewhat in detail to see how the inevitable plus sign ever follows hard upon any attempt to explain them on a purely physico-chemical or behavioristic basis. Take the experience of sense perception. If any psychologists go so far as to deny anything like sense perception, or to suggest casting the very term into the discard (as we recently heard one express himself), our reply is that such denial and suggestion are contrary to all human experience, and therefore do not belong to the field of scientific psychology, but flounder off into the mistland of speculation.

(5) *An Example of Sense Perception.*

We would first analyze the perception of a physical object—say a tree—through the sense of vision. We say we see a tree out yonder on the college campus; but what is the process of our experience? Well, the waves of the ether of space, set into vibration, carry the colors and form of the tree to the eye; they enter through the iris, are re-

fracted with proper co-ordination by the crystalline lens and the humors of the eye-ball in such a way as to form an image of the tree upon the retina, which may be described as the moving-picture curtain in the rear part of the eye; thence, in some real, albeit inexplicable, way, the image is borne by the optic nerve back to the cortex of the brain, where it breaks out into clear consciousness, and we say that we see a tree. Strangely enough, instead of perceiving the inverted image on the retina, we see the tree standing, right end up, out on the campus forty feet away.

Now, we can trace the purely physical process quite clearly up to the point where the sensation or stimulus reaches the cortex (although, of course, there are a thousand mysteries along the pathway); but right there, at the end of the physical process, something entirely different occurs which constitutes our dramatic plus sign—the image of the tree breaks out into our consciousness! We are aware of the existence of the tree. How is the passage from the unconscious physical process to the conscious experience accomplished? What is the bridge that spans the chasm between the unconscious and the conscious? On a purely material basis there is and can be no explanation. The plus sign looms like a phantom before us, and we feel that what lies beyond it is the thing of major importance. Everybody knows that mere material substance, as we know it, has no consciousness and sentiency; yet we are conscious of the presence of the tree out yonder. When we walk out to it, we find it there—a real tree. We may test its reality by feeling its bark and by hearing the soughing of the wind through its foliage. At least three of our senses, therefore, attest its real existence to our awareness.

However, there is still more to follow. By a little attention we are aware of a good deal more than a mere tree.

We note that the tree has a symmetrical bole, with comparatively smooth bark; that the branches spring up slantingly from the trunk; that the bark is dark gray; that the foliage, the season being autumn, is quite variegated in color. Now a new psychical experience comes into the field of consciousness: perceiving that the tree is beautiful, we are aware of a feeling of pleasure, and we may exclaim, "How beautiful!" Can mere physical molecular motion or muscular stimuli and response experience a feeling of esthetic pleasure? Surely there looms here another crucial plus sign.

But still further mental experience may occur in connection with the tree. Why is the foliage so variously tinted? In response to this question, another mental functioning power comes to the fore: we remember that there was a light frost a few nights ago which turned the green of the leaves into browns, reds, pinks, etc. Can mere material substance *remember*? Must there not be a something after that interrogation-point that has the innate power to recall and to bring past observations and experiences into the area of awareness when the proper stimulus from without reaches it?

But the mind can go much further in its relation to the tree. It may reason and schematize, and bring into play the scientific faculty (from *facio*, to work; therefore a functioning power of the mind, and thus etymologically a good term for psychology). To what order of the natural realm does the tree belong? To the organic world. To what phylum of organic objects? To the vegetable. To what family? The trees. To what species? The maple. Can such a complex psychical process be attributed to mere material substance? Surely not. There must be a rational agent or being or entity (call it what you will), that is able

to carry on a process of ratiocination such as has just been depicted.

(6) *Another Example for Emphasis.*

Suppose we try out another kind of sense stimulus in connection with its accompanying psychic reaction. Sitting at your desk reading or writing, certain sounds divert your attention. They are borne on the air in waves, which strike the tympanum of your ear, pass along through the anvil and hammer, and are caught up by the auditory nerve and carried to the proper brain center; then mysteriously the result of the process breaks out into your mental consciousness, and you say, "I hear the playing of the piano." How will you explain the transition of the physical process into the mental experience? There again is an unbridged gap —unless you posit or assume a real agent, the mind, which has the innate capacity for conscious cognition.

It should be further noted that the sound-waves in connection with the piano give a very different impression and experience from the light waves in connection with the tree. You do not think of saying, "I *hear* the tree," but, "I *see* the tree;" nor, "I *see* the music," but, "I *hear* the music." Can such psychical differentiations be assigned merely to sense impressions, molecular motion, or conditions and actions of the viscera and glands?

Again, in listening to the sounds from the piano you experience much more than mere sound; you are arrested and stirred by the beauty of the music if the instrument is skilfully played; perhaps you are so affected that you cease your work at your desk and give yourself up to the enjoyment you experience in listening to the sweet sounds. Then you wonder who the artist is, and you rush downstairs to meet him, and to thank him for the rare and uplifting de-

light he has afforded you. All these experiences follow the plus sign which looms up after the mere physical auditory stimulus has come to you. You never think of saying, "My auditory nerve experienced a delightful feeling by becoming conscious." Somehow, explain it as you will, you feel that it was your *soul* that was thrilled by the enchanting music.

Suppose you hear a beautiful hymn or anthem with ennobling sentiment, then you experience a great deal more than the mere concatenation of sweet sounds; there is the important addendum of spiritual emotion and uplift. Could mere physical action and reaction create a spiritual emotion? In other words, can something be gotten out of nothing? Or, to put it still differently, can an effect belong to an entirely different category from its cause? If there is such an experience as a spiritual emotion—and there surely is in thousands upon thousands of cases—must there not be a spiritual agent or entity capable of having such an experience? If man is all material substance, and nothing more, why in the world and how in the world would material substance ever give rise to ethical and spiritual experiences? These are salient questions. They should be answered.

(7) *Cognition of Qualitative Distinctions.*

Percepts, concepts, and emotions exhibit *qualitative* differences. Men have high and low conceptions and feelings; also good and bad. Such differences are certainly hard to explain on a purely physico-chemical basis, or as the result of muscular action and reaction, or of glandular secretions, or of visceral operations. Think of trying to explain a high and holy joy or love as that sequence of a peculiar action of the viscera! Would not that be dragging a noble science down into the dust? If there are qualitative

distinctions in men's motives, feelings and actions, there must be an entity capable of cognizing such differences. The best explanation is the admission of a rational mind or soul.

(8) *Matter and Mind Alike Mysterious.*

Of course, we recognize the difficulty of the materialistic monist in psychology. He asks, "What is the mind? What do you mean by such a metaphysical something?" Another question provides the best reply: "What is matter?" You believe that matter is the real thing and the only real thing. Then what is matter? No one can tell. If you say, "Matter is composed of atoms and molecules," we ask, "What are *they*?" If they are made up of electrons, what are *they*? If they are the result of vortex rings or eddies in the universal ether, the fundamental question leaps to the fore: What is the universal ether? No one knows, not the wisest chemist or physicist. Pursuing our interrogations to the *ultima thule*, we do not know what matter is in its fundamental essence any more than we know what mind is. Neither do we know what energy is, or electricity, or life. What we know is only phenomena, not noumena (things in themselves).

But we know the phenomena of mind as well as the phenomena of matter. Those of mind are self-consciousness, thought, feeling, volition; those of matter are form, color, hardness, softness, solidity, liquidity, inertia. One class is as patent in human experience as the other. Indeed, our mental experiences seem to be the most intimately and immediately known, because all sense impressions must come into the consciousness in a circuitous route through material media.

If you think of it, you can explain and prove mental facts more readily than you can the physical phenomena con-

nected with them. Huxley used to say, you can explain all mental action and experience by means of molecular motion or by movement in the brain. But you are *not* aware of the molecular motion. You *are* aware of your thinking and feeling, and directly aware of them. You cannot trace with the eye or any other sense the molecular motion in the brain, for the brain is invisible beneath the hair and skull; but you can trace in your consciousness the mental experience.

Many people attempt to explain all psychical experience in terms of muscular, vascular, neurotic, glandular, and even visceral action, reflexes, etc.; but, while they are clearly aware of the mental experiences in their consciousness, they cannot observe with the eye or otherwise the physical movements. Therefore the attempt to account for psychical experiences on a purely physical basis is speculation, not science founded on knowledge.

Recently an advocate of behaviorism declared, while reading his thesis before an audience, that his being there that moment and behaving as he did was the agelong, determined result of all the circumstances that ever touched his own life and the life of his ancestors away back to the original moneron or amoeba. Perhaps so! But he could not *prove* it! He could not go back to the primordial creature, his remote ancestor, through all the complexities of genetic processes, and trace the whole series of causal conditions and circumstances. Therefore he was dealing in guess-work; he was rambling about in the uncertainties of speculation. There was one thing, however, that he could have proved, if he could have proved anything—that he was there because he *wanted* to be there, because he had *decided* to attend the conference, because he had *voluntarily chosen* to be there.

and to read his paper. Had some one called him a mannikin instead of a man, he would have been highly insulted. Had he been called a *robot*, he might have fallen almost into the fighting mood.

Our point is, that his mental experience was very real; his attempt to explain it on a purely behavioristic basis was very phantasmal.³

(9) *The Fact of Human Freedom.*

The normal human mind has also the direct experience of *volition* in numberless instances. Philosophize about it as one may, such psychical facts come clearly within the range of experience. No experience makes a more palpable impact on the center of human consciousness. We choose between alternatives, we determine ourselves, and we know we do—if we know anything at all. The present writer has exhibited this obvious fact of experience in the classroom as follows:

In a few moments, he says, I am going to use my will thus: by lifting my right arm (now hanging by my side) to a horizontal position, then closing all my fingers except my index finger, and then crooking my index finger four times. Wait a moment! Ready! Now I *will* to do it! And the act is performed precisely as I predicted it would be performed. If ever I was conscious of anything in my life, I was conscious that, at a certain self-determined moment, I exerted my will, lifted my arm, and performed the rest of the experiment. Yes, the major thing of which I was conscious was the voluntary exertion of my mind. This simple act of volition and all other acts of the kind are inexplicable on a merely physical basis.

3. The last four paragraphs have been added to the article which appeared in the aforementioned psychological journal.

(10) *Physiology Recognized by Dualists.*

It must not be supposed from the foregoing discussion that the dualist in psychology denies, ignores or slightsls the physiological concomitants in mental experience. Indeed, the consistent dualist must believe in interaction, because he recognizes the reality of both the mind and the body and their marvellous and intimate integration. It is evident to the dualist that the Power that brought man into existence made the mind and the body for each other—made them to be companion-pieces—at least, during this earthly lifetime. Therefore, what affects the one part of man affects the other.

A simple analysis of experience proves that the condition of the body affects the mind. If the body is in perfect health, the mental processes proceed in the normal way. On the other hand, ill health or violent bodily pain will greatly impede and disturb the action of the mind. This is a matter of common experience.

But the opposite is just as patently true. To illustrate, if you have received good news just before starting to your place of business, you walk erectly and rapidly, your step is elastic and sprightly, and your whole frame and movement proclaim the exhilaration of your mental condition. If, however, you have received sad and depressing news, your body becomes stooped, and your feet drag along heavily—that is, if you do not make an effort to camouflage your feeling of dejection.

For this reason, and others that we cannot take time to name, the study of physiology is very interesting for the psychologist, and furnishes an important aid in his studies and their practical application. Science must gather enough data in the realm of reality to form an hypothesis, and then

must try out that hypothesis on other facts, to see whether it will explain them adequately or not. We think we have shown the monistic hypothesis to be inadequate. The supposed causes are not sufficient to account for the grand effects. The primary fact of consciousness ever baffles the attempts of the behaviorist and the monist. So let us broaden our hypothesis to that of dualism and interaction, and try it out in the light of experience.

(11) *Accounting for the Whole Quota of Phenomena.*

In the first place, this hypothesis comports with the almost universal experience of the race, with the *consensus gentium*; for nearly all people seem to feel that they have minds or souls as well as bodies. It would be a queer trick of matter, if it is the only subsistence, to cause the vast majority of people to feel and believe that they have souls when they have none. That would certainly create a fundamental suspicion that the testimony of matter is very unreliable.

In the next place, on the assumption that man has a mind, that it is constituted a self-conscious psychical entity, and that it dwells within the body as its fitting habitat—on this postulate, we hold, all man's psychical and somatic experiences can be explained.

Let us try it out. We are gifted with a visualizing power as a part of our imagination. We may thus visualize the mind as a self-conscious agent ready for action in connection with the brain. Now, whenever a sense impression is carried back into the cortex of the brain through the corresponding physiological channel, there is the self-conscious mind ready to recognize it. When a physical object is seen—a tree, an animal, a man—the mind apprehends it as belonging to the sphere of vision, *i. e.*, as a visible object.

When a sound is carried back to the proper center through the auditory apparatus, the mind is there on the alert to cognize it as the ringing of a bell, or the music of a pipe organ, or the singing of a prima donna. The same is true of all other psychical experiences, whether they come through natural or abstract mental processes. Every mental fact is known by the impact made by it upon the focus of the conscious self, and only in that way. This self, ever alive and alert in waking hours, may be likened to the operator in a central telephone station, who, being always on the *qui vive*, responds to every signal on the board before him, and calls, "Number?"

Should the objection be raised that we have *assumed* that the mind is so constituted as to be self-conscious and to be able to respond to various stimuli in a self-conscious way, we reply that the physicist has to assume that the ether of space is so constituted as to carry light and color on its infinitesimal undulations; the optic nerve is so constituted as to carry the image of an external object back to the cortex; the auditory apparatus is so constituted as to convey the waves of sound to the proper brain center; the nerves of taste to carry to the appropriate organ of the brain the various sensations produced by the passing of food and drink over the palate.

So reasoning from analogy and testing all data in the alembic of experience, we must conclude that the mind is so constituted by its Creator as to be conscious of itself, of perceptions, reasoning processes, moral feelings, spiritual exaltation or depression, and all the other varied facts and phenomena that come within the arcanum of its awareness.⁴

4. The said article contributed to *The American Journal of Psychology* ends at this period.

Here we would add by way of conclusion and application: We believe that the dualism and interaction taught in Christianity's Source Book has been validated scientifically before the tribunal of experience and reason.

4. SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS.

(1) *The Gestalt Psychology.*

There is a German school of psychologists who advocate what is known as *Gestalt* Psychology. It seems to be somewhat hard to define, because of the lack of an exact synonym for *Gestalt* in the English language. Probably the nearest equivalent we have is the word "structure." Some American psychologists prefer the word "configuration." But to our mind these terms are vague and unhelpful. That the human mind does picture invisible things in figures and structures with more or less clearness of outline cannot be denied; but that fact explains nothing in particular regarding mental activity, save that the mind is constructed to act in that way.

The *Gestalt* psychologists contend that, in all mental perceptions, there is always something more set before the mind than the mere physical sensation; that something more is the *Gestalt*. For example, if you see a straight line on the blackboard, you always think of something more than merely a straight line; you have mental concepts of much that is not in a white mark made by a piece of crayon. That straight line has many relations, is conjoined with many other facts, and is united by what is known as Apperception with many other data already in the mind. If you see four dots on the blackboard, placed in a certain position, you add to the perception that they are related to each other in the form of a square or a rectangle, and that fact suggests to the mind many other facts and relations. Many illustra-

tions, we think, might be given of the same inevitable *Gestalt* when suggestions in the realms higher than the physical are made to the mind. Let somebody speak or write the word "virtue," and note how much more than the mere word comes to the mind.

We may be in error, but we believe that the *Gestalt* Psychology corresponds very closely to the "plus sign" which we have depicted in the preceding paragraphs. Call it what you will, there is always a something more in mental perception and action than the mere physical process, describe the latter never so minutely.

Now, that "plus sign"—that *Gestalt*, if you please—points to an entity called the Mind, which is constituted to see, experience, know, relate, to be conscious of, *that something more* than mere physical sensation, and also to be conscious of itself and of its activities. Therefore, we hold that *Gestalt*, when carried to its logical conclusion, leads to Dualism and Interaction, and thus approaches the Christian view.⁵

(2) *Purposive Psychology.*

The world has reason to be thankful to William McDougall, the eminent specialist in psychology, for giving us this good term; or, if he did not originate it, he at least has given it much prominence. In his valuable treatise, *Outline of Psychology*, he penetratingly criticises what he calls "mechanistic science," "the atomistic or 'mosaic' theory of mental process," and "the mechanical mosaic psychology." Then he stoutly upholds "purposive psychology." He be-

5. It is surprising to us that Louis Berman, in his rather incisive book, *The Religion Called Behaviorism*, while he stoutly advocates the *Gestalt* Psychology, yet never seems to be able to decide that there is such an entity as the mind. Evidently he cannot perceive what lies beyond the "plus sign."

gan, he says, as a mechanist, but further study of mental processes convinced him that the mechanistic theory is inadequate.⁶ He, too, sees the unavoidable "plus sign."

We hold that the purposive psychology, when pushed to its logical conclusion, leads inevitably to Dualism. As far as we know anything, we can attribute purpose only to personality and mind; we cannot rightly attribute it to mere material substance. Without a self-conscious Ego the word "purpose" has no meaning; with such an Ego that great word is explained in all its marvelous manifestations and activities. Our only regret is that Dr. McDougall does not move with a firm and stately step on to the doctrine of Dualism.

It will be our next duty and privilege to essay the task of giving a scientific analysis of the human mind, and to decide whether or not, in its broad and basic principles, it corresponds with the teaching of the Sacred Scriptures.

6. See his book, *ut supra*, vii-xii.

CHAPTER VII

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE HUMAN MIND.

In making this analysis our purpose shall be to adhere as closely as possible to the empirical method—that means the method of experience and observation. Let us remember all along that all facts must be tested by the impression they make upon our consciousness. The chemist, the physicist, the biologist, the astronomer, and all the rest, must use the same norm and standard. Knowledge can come to us in only one way — through our consciousness. All science must as far as possible employ the inductive method ; known also as the *a posteriori* method.

While we are endeavoring to analyze the mind, it must not be thought that we are trying to divide it up into infinitesimal fragments and particles. No ; the mind, we repeat, is a solidarity, an integer. But introspection and experience clearly teach us that, if we know anything, the human mind is capable of great diversity of activities, and it is these various powers that we purpose to examine somewhat in detail. It must not be supposed, however, that the minutiae can be exhausted, any more than we can exhaust the varied elements of matter and be sure that we have reached absolutely the ultimate particle or particles. We analyze mental activity as far as we can, or as far as may be profitable, and then we stop. No science can be said to be absolutely complete. There will always be still more to learn ; and that fact is cause for thankfulness.

Of course, it is understood that the Bible does not deal with the human mind according to a scientific formula, nor

does it use all the scientific nomenclature now in vogue; but we shall see, as we proceed, that every fundamental fact of man's mental life corresponds with the fundamental and generic teaching of that holy Book.

Let us now proceed by as orderly a method as possible in the examination of the mind's various functioning powers, activities and relations. Our primary thesis now is the HUMAN MIND.

I. THE INTELLECT.

1. DEFINITION.

The Intellect is that faculty (functioning power) of the human mind which cognizes, carries on thought processes, and forms concepts and judgments.

The Bible clearly recognizes this functioning power of the mind. When Solomon said, "Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom; and with all thy getting, get understanding," he was dealing with the intellect, and advising his readers to cultivate it. The same is true when God said through His prophet Isaiah, "Come now and let us reason together." When Paul said, "Think on these things," he implied the same truth. We have already seen that the New Testament terms for mind (*nous*) and the inner mind (*ennoia*) connote intellectual processes.

2. DISTINCTIONS IN THE INTELLECT.

(1) *The Senses.*

The Senses may be defined as follows: Those powers of the mind which are immediately related to the nervous system through which man knows the outer world and is intelligently connected with his natural environment.

The senses may be classified as follows: a. Sight—the optical sense; b. Hearing—the auditory sense; c. Touch—

the tactile sense; d. Smell—the olfactory sense; e. Taste—the gustatory sense; f. Other senses (perhaps aspects of some of the five cardinal senses), such as hunger, thirst, pains in the muscles and joints, general feeling of healthfulness and exhilaration, feeling of depression and lassitude, etc.

Those who know their Bibles well will at once realize that all these senses are recognized in the Bible, and their proper use and control are inculcated. The divine plan of giving the world a revelation through a book, the Bible, enables people to get the message of God through the sense of sight by reading. The institution of preaching brings the gospel to people through hearing. Even people who are blind and deaf may learn the gospel message through the sense of touch by reading the Bible printed in raised letters. Perhaps the Bible term for "reins" refers to those inner and vital bodily processes that really affect the mind for good or ill; therefore the Psalmist prays: "Examine me, O Lord, try my reins and my heart."

We venture to suggest another definition of the senses: That part of man's complex constitution in which neurosis and psychosis meet and function together. Let it never be forgotten that, in canvassing our total human experience, it is found that sensory activity involves both psychical and physical processes.

Under the head of the senses, it becomes necessary to give something of an analysis of the human body, especially as far as its various parts are more or less closely related to mental experience and activity.

a. *The central nervous system.*

This comprises the brain and spinal cord. The brain is divided as follows: the fore-brain (consisting of the cere-

brum, the thalamus, bulbs, tracts, ventricles; the cortex or outer layer, supposed to be the seat of the mind); the mid-brain, composed of several ganglia of fibers; the hind-brain, known as the cerebellum.

The average weight of the adult brain is from 45 to 50 ounces. The cortex consists of gray matter, is about one-eighth of an inch thick, and is composed of cells. Beneath the cortex is the white matter of the brain, which consists of nerve fibers, which seem to be the carriers of thought, feeling and volition. Evidently the finest form of organized matter of which we know anything are the cells of the cortex which seem to form the physical basis of all mental processes. Next in fineness of texture are probably the nerve fibers of the white matter of the brain and spinal cord.

The spinal column (the backbone, composed of thirty-one vertebræ) contains the spinal cord, which consists of gray and white matter, the former made up of cells, the latter of fibers.

From the brain and the spinal cord the nerves radiate to all parts of the body, carrying stimuli from the outer world to the mind and, in turn, orders from the conscious and volitional self.

b. *The peripheral nervous system.*

This system consists of the nerve fibers running out from the central system, and their end-organs. There are twelve pairs of cranial nerves and thirty-one pairs of spinal nerves. The ingoing nerves are called afferent nerves, and are sensory; the outgoing ones are called efferent, and are motor.

The unit of the nervous system is the *neurone*, consisting of a cell and two sets of fibers: the dendrites, leading into the cell, and the axones, leading out of the cell (dendrite, a tree; axone, an axis). The point at which the two

sets of nerves come near each other is called the *synapse* (meaning to fasten with), and it is believed that messages leap over this space from one to the other, and thus connect with the various neurones.

Does the mind travel along these fine, complicated routes in its dealings with the body? It is probable that it does, but no one can be sure; it is largely a matter of conjecture. What we do know, however, is that we receive conscious sensations from the outer world, and that we in turn can by conscious mental acts produce some wonderful effects upon our natural environment. All the discoveries, improvements and inventions which man effects as he operates on the natural realm furnish evidence of the marvelous and mysterious conjunction and co-operation of the mind and the body.

This intimate connection is recognized in the Bible when the apostle enjoins upon us to "present our bodies a living sacrifice unto God," and to "be transformed by the renewing of our mind" (Rom. 12:1,2); also when the command is given to have our "hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water" (Heb. 10:22).

c. *The sympathetic nervous system.* .

This is also called the autonomic system—that is, self-ruling. It is so called because it controls those functions of the body that require automatic action, namely, circulation, respiration, digestion, nutrition, glandular secretions and excretions. It would be impossible for the mind consciously to carry on these processes. Man would have to know much more about them than he now does to control them; moreover, he would have no time to rest and sleep or meditate on other matters. The purpose of providence is discernible here.

The autonomic system consists of three groups of nerve ganglia running to the brain and the spinal cord, and also of the various glands that perform so necessary a part in the physiological functions. Among the glands we may mention the thyroid, pituitary, adrenal, pineal, lachrymal, salivary, gastric, and perhaps the vermiform appendix. Part of the action of some of these glands is under the control of the will; others do their work in an entirely automatic way. It is thought by some physicians that the appendix secretes and distributes certain substances that are useful to the normal action of the body, especially in early childhood. It is not therefore a relique of man's bestial pedigree. If it were, it would have disappeared long ago as a useless organ.

The heart, which belongs to this system, is closely associated with many of man's mental processes. Under strong mental excitement the heart beats most palpably, even more so than does the brain. Perhaps it might be rightly held that the mind inhabits the whole body, but that its center and base of operations is the brain, while the emotions are in some way closely connected with the action of the heart. Nothing dogmatic can be asserted here from the viewpoint of scientific psychology. The Bible evidently connects the feelings closely with the heart.

For fuller discussions of bodily functioning we refer the reader to the works on General Psychology.¹

(2) *The Instincts.*

The instincts may be defined as those innate body-mind urges that move men and animals to do things that are nec-

1. Among them we call attention to the following: Roop, *General Psychology*; Breese, *Psychology*; Titchener, *A Textbook of Psychology*; Calkins, *A First Book in Psychology*; Pillsbury, *Essentials of Psychology*.

essary to their existence or their well-being, without conscious thought and volition.

It is difficult to classify the instincts. They may be physico-mental; again they may not be mental at all, but simply endowments of the physical life. Men and animals have them in common; perhaps animals have been more richly equipped with them because they do not have the added rational and intellectual faculties to guide them. If animals were not thus endowed, they could not exist in their environment.

In some animals the instincts seem to be capable of considerable development, especially under human training, until they perform exploits that appear very much like a simple order of intelligence; but just what it is we do not know. At least, the repertoire of animals is very limited. They cannot be taught to read, write, speak, reason (save very feebly), distinguish between right and wrong, or recognize God and worship Him. All of us know that a little child can soon outstrip the most gifted animals in processes that are definitely psychological. If an animal like an ape or chimpanzee, under human training, does a few of the simplest stunts that look like human reasoning or intelligence, we exclaim with wonder over them. But when such simple things are done by human beings, they are so commonplace and simple that we scarcely notice them. When has a chimpanzee been able to solve a problem in mathematics or compose a treatise on science? He cannot even learn the alphabet!

Much ado is made now-a-days over human instincts by psychologists. William McDougall devotes several lengthy chapters to them in his recent book,² tracing them to man's

2. McDougall, *Outline of Psychology*, pp. 43-176, especially Chapter V.

"animal ancestry." This is not necessary. Animals do not develop into human beings today, and have never been actually known to do so in the whole history of the world. To say that this feat occurred millions of years ago—a time entirely too remote to be empirically or historically investigated—is to beg the question.

The Christian view is better; more in accord with the facts of animal and human life as we know them. This view is that God, in creating and fashioning man, wisely endowed him with such instincts as he needed for living and functioning in a natural environment. Therefore, it was consistent to make him in some respects like the creatures around him, and then super-add the higher endowment of rational intelligence. If the human infant were not given certain instincts to begin with, it could not survive even with the best of parental care. Watch a new-born infant making an effort to secure its first food, and be convinced that such an instinctive endowment is a teleological and providential arrangement.

A word more: it may not be scientific to place the instincts under the intellect, for we know so little about their fundamental nature; yet if they are to be treated at all in a work on psychology, it is difficult to see where else they can be located.

(3) *The Intuitions.*

By this term we mean our immediate perceptions of truth without the accompaniment of any conscious logical or analytical processes.

In this place we distinguish between instincts and intuitions. By instincts we mean those natural urges of our being which we have in common with our animal companions and which are necessary to our physical existence. By

the intuitions we mean those higher immediate perceptions of truth and reality which belong truly to the intellectual life.

It may be interesting to classify and define our major intuitions. We shall see at once that, while they are innate in man, they are entirely beyond the instincts of animals, thus establishing a generic difference between them and human beings.

a. *Cognition of outward reality.*

We directly cognize the world of objects around us as real. No one questions the reality of the outer world—unless he loses himself in misty philosophical speculations which soon land him in universal doubt.

The Bible agrees with this experience in always representing the material world as a reality, never as an illusion. Its very first verse carries the implication of the real existence of the heavens and the earth after their creation. Thus Biblical psychology keeps its feet on the ground. It works along the line of realism. It agrees with experiential psychology.

b. *Cognition of Self.*

This intuition is known as self-consciousness. It is the power of the human mind by which a person knows himself to be himself. Through this mysterious power a person is able to distinguish himself from all other objects. It is the gift of egoity, the recognition of selfhood. It is the core of personality. A person is a being who can say, "I," and knows what he means by saying it.³

To refuse to recognize this fact of the Self (the Ego), with its power of self-recognition, means to put oneself out-

3. See Professor G. A. Wilson, *The Self and its World*—a work that is quite profound and satisfying.

side of the sphere of empirical psychology; it lands one in speculation, and ignores the crucial factuality of human experience the world over. If there is an outstanding experience, it is that of the sense of Ihood. What is the use, anyway, to try to dissolve into thin air man's elemental experiences! A little child less than four years old will interlard its speech with "I," "I," "I," all day long.

To say that the mind's ability to make itself both subject and object is a profound mystery and to deny its reality on that account, would be tantamount to denying mental perception—even that of the senses—because we cannot understand the process, as Thomas Huxley showed us long ago. By the same token we ought to deny that chemistry deals with real entities, for no one can understand the mysterious essence of matter; no one can tell why H^2O produces water; we simply know that this is the correct chemical formula; we cannot explain the *why* of it.

On this point again the teaching of the Bible agrees with human experience and observation. Everywhere in the holy Book personality is recognized and its importance stressed. Christ taught that it would profit a man nothing to gain the whole world and lose his own soul (Mark 8: 36); and surely the term "soul" in such a context must connote sentient and self-conscious personality. The supreme value of personality is taught in our Lord's great saying: "Likewise I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth" (Luke 15:7).

And, best of all, the Bible teaches clearly that self-conscious personality will perdure throughout the eternal future: "For we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house

not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (2 Cor. 5:1). Note the recurrence of the personal pronoun "we" in this text.

c. *Cognition of Time and Space.*

Here again we are in the realm of mystery; but that does not delete our innate conception of time and space. The fact is, we can scarcely think at all except in these terms. Of course, we do speak of infinity and eternity, and therefore we feel—we might say, know—that they must exist; yet as far as our conceptions of them are concerned we are likely to visualize them in terms of infinite space and interminable time—the former conceivable only in parts, the latter only in the succession of seconds. The patent fact remains that we intuitively think of time and space, and know that our lives and experiences are vitally bound up with them.

d. *Cognition of Cause and Effect.*

The moment it is suggested to our minds, we intuitively recognize the law of causality, which is that every effect and event must have an adequate cause. Somehow, it is impossible to imagine the contrary. All science and philosophy make this law fundamental. Whenever the scientist beholds an effect, a movement, an event, he feels sure that it must have back of it a sufficient cause. If he saw a book moving across the desk with no visible cause, he still would believe that there was somewhere an adequate force that overcomes the natural inertia of the book.

This innate demand of the intellect for an adequate cause constitutes one of the fundamental arguments for the theistic view of the world (called in works on Theism the cosmological argument). It is founded on the well-known principle that the universe is contingent, dependent and

finite; therefore it must have been brought into existence by an adequate cause. The only adequate cause of which the mind can conceive is an all-powerful and all-wise God. And since there are personal, self-conscious personalities in the cosmos, the God who created it and them must be a personal being. For something cannot come out of nothing. *Ex nihilo nihil fit.* Besides, an effect cannot be different from and qualitatively higher than its cause. Water cannot rise higher than its source.

Here again the Bible proves itself to be both scientific and philosophical, for it teaches that an infinite personal God is the Creator of the universe; and also its Preserver and Redeemer. Therefore it assigns an adequate cause for the universe and all its varied phenomena.

e. *Cognition of Truth and Error.*

A child need not be more than a few years old before it begins intuitively to distinguish between truth and error. We do not hold that the mind has innate ideas; but it certainly has innate capacity for cognizing many things immediately when they are suggested, without subjecting them to logical processes. And that is what is meant by the term "intuition." Without such an innate ability society could not continue to exist. Try to think of a social organism in which truth were utterly disregarded; where nobody could trust anybody else.

Here the Bible proves itself fundamentally correct once more in making a sharp differentiation between truth and error. Jesus put it profoundly: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free;" "I am the way, the truth and the life."

f. *Cognition of Beauty and Sublimity.*

The esthetic faculty of the mind immediately perceives

at least the primary fact of beauty in the world. It also immediately cognizes that which is repulsive and experiences the corresponding feeling (to be noted later). Of course, this faculty, like all the other intuitions, can be cultivated and refined, but the rudimentary intuition must be there or it could not be developed.

g. Cognition of Right and Wrong.

Here we are in the presence of the *conscience*, which we take to be a specialized faculty of the mind for perceiving moral distinctions. That there is such a mental ability no one should deny. Morality is one of the outstanding phenomena of the human world. There is not a nation or tribe which does not have some sense of right and wrong, however crude and mistaken some of the notions of primitive people may be.

The fact that in some tribes moral ideas are very imperfect furnishes no argument for a denial of the conscience faculty. Their notions of other matters are also very limited and primitive. They have very crude ideas of science; does that mean that man has no innate power for pursuing and formulating science? So they have very imperfect conceptions of religion; that surely does not mean that man in general is not a religious being. So with morality—while it can be developed, refined and enlightened, yet the rudimentary intuition must be there, with its concreted potentialities, or no such development would be possible. A state of moral excellence cannot be developed in a stone, or a plant, or an animal. Indeed, no being is capable of moral action which has not an innate sense of right and wrong, which is not possessed of rational intelligence, and endued with the power of freedom of choice. An automaton is not capable of morality. Neither is a robot. But human beings

are; *ergo*, they have by nature and creation the ethical intuition.

Differences of moral judgment do not nullify the fact of conscience. No one assumes that conscience is infallible any more than are other faculties of the human mind. Because your eyes are sometimes deceived is no proof that you have no capacity for eyesight. As to conscience, it cognizes intuitively the primary and basic fact of a difference and antagonism between right and wrong. After that, in applying the fundamental principle to the various situations in life, the judgment and reason must come into play. The same psychical process obtains in dealing with other facts of life.

It may be added here that conscience belongs not only to the intellect, but also to the sensibilities or emotions. It is a complex faculty. We often say, "I feel that such and such a course is right," or "wrong," as the case may be; and sometimes we cannot give a clear reason for our presentiment. However, this connotes the popular use of the word conscience. Technically speaking, it is a cognition or innate perception, and the feeling of right and wrong follows in the wake of the perception, as is the case in all mental processes. First there must be a perception in the light of consciousness; then each perception stirs its corresponding emotion or feeling.

What is the teaching of Holy Writ on the subject of conscience? It is of a very high character. While we do not find a synonym for it in the Old Testament, the fact is everywhere taken for granted that man has such a capacity —a faculty that at once responds to the suggestion of right and wrong. When God set "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil" (note the exact phrasing) in the midst of the garden of Eden, and forbade eating thereof, He assumed

that Adam and Eve had the capacity to respond to the suggestion, and in some measure to distinguish between right and wrong. Wherever subsequently moral mandates and precepts were given to the people of the Old Testament dispensation, the fact of conscience is taken for granted. "Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil" (Isa. 5:20). This passage implies conscience, and shows that it may become impaired and corrupted in its functioning; and yet the very fact that woe was pronounced against the people in their hearing proves that far back of and beneath the accumulation of evil, there still persisted the silent monitor to which an appeal might be made.

In the New Testament the word for conscience (*suneidesis*, a knowing with oneself) occurs frequently (at least thirty times). "Being convicted by their own conscience" (John 8:9); "I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day" (Acts 23:1); "Their conscience also bearing witness" (Rom. 2:15); "The answer of a good conscience toward God" (1 Pet. 3:21).⁴

h. Cognition of God.

This capacity of the soul may be called the theistic intuition. Perhaps it cannot rightly be said that the human mind innately holds the idea of God (yet we must not be too dogmatic here); still, experience and observation prove positively that man has the innate receptivity for the God-idea when it is suggested by human teaching or by the phenomena of nature. This is empirically demonstrated by the

4. For a fuller development of the various problems involved in the operations of conscience, see the following works: M. Valentine, *Theoretical Ethics* (consult the index); L. S. Keyser, *A System of General Ethics* (third edition), pp. 92-111, 144-149, and other places; *A Manual of Christian Ethics*, pp. 58-62; H. U. Roop, *Christian Ethics*, pp. 130-139.

fact that all nations and tribes have some idea of a supernatural world and of one or more supernatural beings. Let it be remembered, too, that religion is not a mere bagatelle among the peoples of the earth, but is in many countries the dominating power. So if man has any outstanding natural intuitions, he has the sense of God.

No argument is needed to prove that the Bible is pre-eminently a theistic book. The name of God occurs again and again on almost every page. In this respect, then, the Bible and universal experience and observation are in agreement. The Biblical teaching is again seen to be corroborated by scientific psychology.

The Bible also gives the most rational account of the origin of the theistic intuition. When it teaches that man was created in the divine image, and then depicts Him as holding converse with man, the situation implies on the face of it that man was originally endowed by his Creator with a capacity for cognizing God. The whole Biblical teaching also indicates that the God-idea was not entirely lost in the fall of man.

CHAPTER VIII

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE HUMAN MIND (continued).

I. THE INTELLECT (continued).

2. DISTINCTIONS IN THE INTELLECT (continued).

(4) *The Understanding.*

By this term is meant the mind's power to perceive, think, recall, reason, and form judgments.¹ This mental power is capable of somewhat refined analysis and extended classification. Let us always bear in mind that a faculty is simply the mind's power to act in certain ways that can be more or less clearly defined and distinguished from its other powers and activities.

a. *Introspection.*

This mental power may be defined as follows: The mind's ability to look in upon itself and to perceive, scrutinize and analyze its own states and operations.

The mind can, as it were, turn in upon itself. This ability belongs inherently to the mind and is entirely peculiar to a psychical entity. It is unique. No other entity or force is thus invested. On account of the difficulty of explaining how an entity can thus inspect its own states and actions, some psychologists of the present day gird at it. It belongs to "metaphysics," they say with some contempt.

1. For a discussion of the relation of the other faculties to the Understanding, see a later section. Perhaps the term may not be altogether justified etymologically. However, as to its general usage it means the power of the mind to function with intelligence—that is, as we say, "understandingly."

Our reply is, such men are in the stranglehold of materialistic concepts, and do not or cannot think in higher terms. Yet if they will stop to reflect for a moment, they will see that there can be no psychology if we are not able to know ourselves, to turn our thought inward and inspect our mental actions. It is impossible for us to explain our mental states and acts unless we can study them by making them our objects. Whenever you say, "I feel glad today," you are asserting the power you have to know your own inner, psychical emotions. Those who deny or scorn the doctrine of the mind's power of introspection depart from the scientific method of observation and experience, and enter the field of philosophical speculation to find another explanation than the clear and evident one. "Then know thyself," said Pope, the poet. He knew that such achievement was possible. It is known by intuition, and can be rationalized by being brought into the field of the understanding.

The Bible recognizes and implies this power of the mind, even though it may not make use of the term "introspection." Let us cite a few examples: "For He (God) knoweth the secrets of the heart" (Ps. 44:21). Had not the Psalmist known that there were secrets within his heart, he never would have thought of making such a statement about God's knowledge of them. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick" (Prov. 12:12); "The heart knoweth its own bitterness; and a stranger doth not intermeddle with its joy" (Prov. 14:10); "Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do" (Acts 2:37; note Peter's answer)? "But let it be the hidden man of the heart" (1 Pet. 3:4); "If perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee" (Acts 8:22); "I know that in me dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18); "By this

we know that we love the children of God" (1 John 5:2); "If our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things. Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then we have confidence toward God" (1 John 3:20, 21).

b. Perception.

This is the mind's ability to cognize objects, actions, motives, etc., as realities. The content is called a percept. The mere cognition of reality is an intuition; when it is in any degree reflected upon, it is taken up into the understanding. When it is associated with and related to other concepts already in the mind, the act is known as Apperception. No percept can remain alone or single; it is at once set in the midst of a mental *milieu*. Everywhere in the Bible these psychical powers are taken for granted. "The woman said, Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet;" "They perceived that they were unlearned men;" "When James perceived the grace that was given unto me." And many more.

c. Conception.

This is the mind's ability to form judgments or notions by combining and relating percepts (called concepts). You may see an object, but it does not remain a bare object in your mind; by relating it to knowledge already in your mind, you arrive at the concept of a tree or a bird. That the Bible takes this mental power for granted is evident from the very fact that man is admonished to increase in knowledge and wisdom. How is knowledge augmented? By adding percept to percept and concept to concept.

d. Reflection.

A most useful mental power is this: The mind's ability to carry on continuous thinking processes on a given subject —that is, to "mull over."

Note how the Bible stresses this mental exercise: "But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in His law doth he meditate day and night;" "I remember the days of old; I meditate on all thy works; I meditate on the works of thy hands;" "I love thy law: it is my meditation all the day;" "Meditate on these things" (1 Tim. 4:15). The apostle enjoins reflecting on the highest things: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, *think on these things*" (Phil. 4:8).

It need not be urged that reflecting is a Christian duty and privilege. God wants us to think.

e. *Memory.*

Here we have the recalling ability of the mind. It is the mind's capacity for living over the past. How wonderful a power it is, and how necessary! If we could not connect the present with the past, life itself would be impossible. God certainly knew what He was doing when He created the mind with this power of recollection. You can remember who you are. You can know through this endowment that you are the same "you" you were when you were a child playing in the meadow by the babbling brook, and listening to the trills of the song-sparrows.

And our holy Book furnishes the best instruction on the use of this faculty, and also the most solemn warning. "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth" (Eccl. 12:1). Our Lord gave this injunction: "Remember Lot's wife." In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus He puts into the mouth of Abraham these solemn words directed to the rich man in torment: "Son, remember" (Luke 16:25), proving that memory carries over into the next life.

Nothing helps to enrich and fortify life more than to commit to memory choice passages of Scripture, uplifting epigrams, wise adages and mottoes, and good and wholesome poetical selections. The trouble with many people is, they do not store their minds in their youth with knowledge that will afford them inspiration and joy and comfort in their subsequent lives. Thus many of them spend their last years in a depressed and discontented state of mind.

We know one man who has often expressed himself in this way: He is thankful that in his boyhood days he committed many verses of the Bible ("learned them by heart"), because afterward, when he went away from home and passed from the immediate care of his parents, he declares that, whenever he came to a difficult place or met with a temptation, the appropriate Biblical verse would at once spring up in his mind, and help him to win the victory.

f. Association.

This excellent mental endowment may be thus defined: The mind's ability and inherent tendency to connect related facts, thus making consequential thinking and living possible.

This is a notable "complex" in modern psychology. "It is a network of associated ideas with a common emotional coloring."² We might put it in this colloquial way: Whenever you think of something, it makes you think of something else.

So fundamental to human thinking is this element that it seems to be essential to the very existence of mental life, belonging to the same class as self-consciousness, introspection, perception and memory. Still, it must be regarded as only one of the mind's powers, and must not be looked upon

2. C. V. Crabb, *Psychology's Challenge to Christianity*.

as giving the explanation of all our psychical experience and action. Some years ago it was overworked by a certain school of psychologists. Self-consciousness and memory are just as necessary to mental life as is association.

g. Imagination.

How shall we define this outstanding and necessary faculty? It is the mind's ability to place before itself objects that are either absent or fanciful. Some one has described it as "the picture-making power of the mind."³ This is the faculty for fiction, drama, poetry. Wordsworth wrote a whole book entitled "Poems of the Imagination," and another collection called "Poems of the Fancy."

Has the Bible aught to say of this faculty? It certainly has. Speaking of the wicked antediluvians, it says: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (Gen. 6: 5; cf. 8: 21); "For I know their imaginations," etc. (Deut. 31: 21); "But became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened" (Rom. 1: 21).

These references are to evil imaginations, but the many Psalms and other poetical parts of the Bible indicate the beautiful play of the fancy. Jesus used parables, and sometimes employed language so rhythmical that His statements deserve to be called "prose poems." The wonderful imagery in the descriptions of the heavenly city in the book of Revelation are, no doubt, intended to appeal to the imagination and create lofty feelings and aspirations.

Dr. Snowden, in his book on religious psychology,⁴ gives a very fine and suggestive treatment of the imagination. He

3. J. H. Snowden, *The Psychology of Religion*, p. 36.

4. *Ibid* (for pages consult the index).

says that it is "a means of the Christian life by making truth vivid;" that it is adapted for "correcting our faults;" that it helps to "build up character;" that it has an excellent "use in preaching;" that it is "creative;" that it can be used to illustrate truth; and that the study of imaginative literature is a good discipline.

It is advisable for the Christian minister to cultivate his imagination to some extent, in order that he may arrest the attention of his hearers and cultivate an enlivened style; but he must also be careful not to overwork his imagination lest he be given to distorting the truth and mistaking his fancies for realities. While language should be choice and engaging, care should be taken that it is not made over-picturesque so as to become "florid." It is not good for a preacher or a teacher to divert attention from his message by too rhetorical a literary style.

h. Faith.

Faith is the mind's capacity for believing and trusting. Even a casual analysis of the mind will show that it possesses such a faculty.. The little child intuitively trusts. Besides, a child need not be more than a few years old before it knows whom it trusts and whom it does not trust. Human society would be impossible without the exercise of a large measure of faith. You cannot ride on a railway train for even a short distance without exercising confidence in many of the operators along the way—the conductor, the brakemen, the engineer, fireman, the dispatchers, the switchmen.

In human society mutual confidence connotes a normal status, whereas distrust and suspicion imply the very opposite. The ideal family is the one where perfect love and trust exist between husband and wife and between parents

and children. Had not sin come into the world, we might trust everybody; we would not need to lock our doors, nor worry about our financial investments. The very fact that we cannot trust everybody implies the sad fact that something has gone wrong with the world—that an abnormal condition exists.

Thus mutual trust means a normal status. Faith, therefore, is a good thing *per se*, while doubt is the opposite. Faith is positive; doubt is negative. Faith is constructive; doubt is destructive. Faith is essential in a moral and spiritual economy. Doubt is a necessary result of a disturbance that has been injected into the world.

As this is true in man's general and civil relations, it must also be true in his relation to God, his Maker and Preserver. The most rational act of the human soul is to trust the Ultimate Reality—that is, the Ultimate Personality. To put too much trust in temporal and finite things is to destroy the solidity and stability of life. To trust Him who is "from everlasting to everlasting," who is "the same yesterday, today and forevermore," is to stabilize the life and bring real peace and contentment to the soul.

We believe this kind of reasoning to be true and conclusive. It is cause for gratitude that the Bible corroborates this view of the rationality and experience of faith. Many proof-passages might be cited. Indeed, the recitation of all the Biblical statements about faith would so grow in volume and inspiration as to sound almost like an anvil chorus.

Note a few outstanding passages: "And Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness" (Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:3); "By faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain" (Heb. 11:4); "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him" (Job 13:15); "Therefore

being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1); "By grace are ye saved through faith" (Eph. 2:5); "Without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. 11:6); "And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith" (1 John 5:4); "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14:23).

Thus faith is both a Christian and a rational act of the soul. It is not blind credulity, as unbelievers are wont to allege, for there are too many highly educated people who believe in Christ and the Bible for such a charge to be true. Besides, whenever people accept Christ, they receive the inner assurance that He is "the way, the truth and the life."

i. *Hope.*

The definition of hope is: the mental faculty by which men are led to expect the attainment of their desires. What we hope for we do not yet realize as our possession, but we have some ground for believing that in due time we shall actually have it.

Hope is also counted among the Christian graces: "And now abideth faith, hope and love" (1 Cor. 13:13). Says the apostle, "We are saved by hope" (Rom. 8:24). This does not mean that we are saved from *sin* by hope, for that is made possible by divine grace alone; but we are saved from *despair* by hope. "If in this life only we have hope, we are of all men most miserable" (1 Cor. 15:19); "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27); "Which hope we have an anchor to the soul, both sure and steadfast, which entereth into that within the veil" (Heb. 6:19); "And hope maketh not ashamed" (Rom. 5:5).

In these facts we see again that Biblical and empirical psychology walk hand in hand; for all of us have had the conscious experience of hope, but of its physical basis we know little or nothing.

j. *The Scientific Faculty.*

Here we have the mind's ability and propensity to investigate, systematize and correlate the data of experience and observation.

This is an important power of the human mind. Every intelligent Christian is the friend of true science, because he desires the truth, knowing that error can never be permanently beneficial, even if it may sometimes seem to be so for a while. Then the Christian also recognizes the great practical value of science to the world. Most of our modern conveniences and inventions that help so much to enrich our lives, are due to the researches and discoveries of men of science. We hold, as has often been said before, that no conflict should exist between the results of true, empirical science and the teaching of the Christian Scriptures.

And what is the relation between the Bible and science? So far as regards many of the sciences the Bible says very little. What it says when it touches on the realms of physical and other sciences is true; but it does not elaborate; its data are not given in developed form; they are not placed in a schematized order. For example, the Bible clearly teaches us the truth about the origin of the universe, but it tells us very little about technical astronomy (although it does seem to suggest that the earth is not the center of the cosmos, but only its outskirts). The Bible tells us how life originated, but it does not reveal to us anything about technical biology. It informs us as to origin of man, but there are many things about anthropology that are left unrevealed and thus left for human investigation.

Evidently God wisely made known to man the fundamental things, the things that he ought to know and that he could not discover for himself, and then said to him, as it were, "Now from these basic data you may, if you desire,

unfold the various scientific systems." All this is in accord with the Scripture, which represents God as saying to the first human pair: "Be fruitful and multiply, and complete the earth, and subdue it" (Gen. 1: 28-30). The Bible does not set forth its data in schematized form, but furnishes the fundamental material for the sciences of theology, ethics and psychology when combined with data gathered from other sources. It leaves plenty of room for the exercise, development and discoveries of the scientific faculty.

k. The Logical Faculty.

We may define this faculty as follows: the mind's power to carry on discursive processes—that is, to reason from established premises and draw the proper inferences and conclusions.

There are many references to the reason in the Bible. It is worth our while to note a few of them: "I applied my heart to know and to search, and to seek out wisdom and the reason of things" (Eccl. 7: 25); "The sluggard is wiser in his own conceit than seven men who can render and reason" (Prov. 26:16); "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord" (Isa. 1:18); "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures" (Acts 17:2); "And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled" (Acts 24:25); "And be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason for the hope that is in you with meekness and fear" (1 Pet. 3:15).

Here again we note that Christianity is not a system of superstition and credulity; it involves the proportionate exercise of all man's mental powers, including those of reason.

1. *The Philosophical Faculty.*

This important mental power and propensity may be defined as follows: the mind's ability to formulate a world-view, and to find the ultimate cause and unifying principle and power in this diversified universe.

Here again there is a beautiful coalescence between the Bible and philosophy. While the Bible does not set forth a philosophical system in schematized form nor in technical terms, nor attempt to solve undecipherable problems, such as Ontology, Epistemology, etc.; yet it does, in a most basic way, reveal the only true and adequate philosophy—that is to say, it proclaims on all its pages the theistic world-view. And such a world-view is the only one that can adequately account for the universe and all its diversified phenomena. And the most engaging feature of this philosophy is, that it furnishes an adequate explanation of the highest facts and experiences, as well as of those of a lower qualitative order. It effectively accounts for the following facts: the origin and continued existence of matter, energy, life, sentiency, self-consciousness, personality, morality, spirituality. An all-wise, all-powerful personal God, such as the Bible portrays and proclaims, back of and in the universe, accounts for all the facts that are and for all about which we know aught.⁵

m. *The Spiritual Faculty.*

The ability of the soul to apprehend God, and to hold communion with Him and other spiritual beings.

This is, in the Christian world-view, the highest of man's mental endowments. Reason ought to, and does, corroborate this Christian view; for it is rational to believe that

5. For an extended development of this all-important thesis see the author's forthcoming work, *The Philosophy of Christianity*.

God created and preserves the universe; in no other way can it be effectively accounted for. That being so, it follows, "as the day the night," that man, being a rational and personal being, should have a specialized power of mind through which he can know his Creator and Preserver, and hold fellowship with Him. Well, the Bible teaches this basic truth.

The conception of God (or, at least, of something supernatural) is practically world-wide, and everywhere it connotes the possibility of some kind of communication with Him. Therefore that conception and possibility is imbeded in man's mental constitution. Whence could it have come but from God? If nothing but matter is existent, how could mere matter ever evolve into mind and give to it the idea of God? If that were so, matter would surely be a wonder-worker—a miracle monger, indeed!

Now, since man, as we have noted, has a spiritual faculty, and since experience, observation and analysis prove that he has, no one can be a thoroughgoing psychologist and at the same time ignore this outstanding part of man's psychical structure. Christianity is broad enough to recognize and account for this faculty as well as for all the rest of man's mental equipment.

(5) Relation of Sense, Intuition and Understanding.

No doubt there are other intellectual powers of the mind besides those that have been treated in the foregoing discussion; we cannot presume to be exhaustive in dealing with so wonderful and versatile an entity as the human soul. Some one has truly said, "Man is fearfully and wonderfully made." We think, however, that all man's basic intellectual activities can be catalogued under one or another of the afore-named faculties. As will be seen later, some

psychologists use a somewhat different terminology in their discussion of mental phenomena than we have used. We have felt, however, that our classification was as concrete and clear as the subject-matter would permit.

When we come to analyze man's intellectual activities as pictured in the foregoing discussion, we shall find that they are most intimately related, and that no faculty stands alone. Let us note some of these relations.

a. *Sense Perceptions.*

When the senses carry stimuli from the outer world to the brain centers, the mind intuitively reacts to them, cognizes them, and accepts the reality of the objects producing them. It is only highly imaginative and speculative processes that afterward arise in some minds that lead to the denial of the experience of the reality of the outer material world. This is what is known as the philosophy of Idealism, which has already been dealt with in this treatise.⁶

But now note the peculiar action of the mind. No sense perception remains purely that. The Understanding immediately reacts to the stimuli produced through the senses, and begins to function, sometimes very slightly, it is true, but at other times, dependent on the person, in a very intricate and elaborate way. It may bring the perception or perceptions into its own field, examine them, reflect upon them, reason about them, form judgments and notions regarding them, use the memory and the imagination if need be, then arrange the data thus gathered into a schematized system, and thus formulate a science and even attempt to deduce a philosophy. In this complex process the mind also makes use of Apperception and Association.

6. For a fuller treatment see the author's *A System of Natural Theism* (second edition), pp. 98-105, and other references in the index.

b. *The Intuitions.*

Here we note the same spontaneous action of the mind. No intuition remains purely an intuition. Other facts and experiences cluster about it. First we have the intuitions of the truth in its simple and primal forms, such as self-consciousness, cognition of reality, of time and space, of right and wrong, of beauty and sublimity, etc.; then, if the process is carried further, the perceived facts are taken up into the Understanding, where reflection, memory, imagination, reason, etc., work upon them, form judgments and notions, formulate a science and perhaps work out a philosophy.

How marvelous are these powers and activities! It can be readily seen on a little reflection that, if the mind, to begin with, were not equipped with natural instincts and innate intuitions, it would not be able to function at all in a world constituted as ours is. And, further, if the mind had no higher abilities than instincts and intuitions, no development, no science, no philosophy, no religion would be possible, and it is even doubtful whether man could exist at all in his present context. Thus a true psychology must treat the mind as an integer, and yet as dowered with the power to act in a great diversity of ways.

CHAPTER IX

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE HUMAN MIND (continued).

II. THE SENSIBILITIES (Emotions).

1. DEFINITION.

The Sensibilities are the responses of the mind in conscious feeling to the varied processes of the Intellect.

From the physical viewpoint some one has suggested the following definition: "An emotion is a state of consciousness arising from the blocking of natural reactions to stimuli by a flood of sensations producing excessive glandular secretions."

This labored attempt strikes us as being more speculation than science. It certainly is not empirical psychology; for we never have such an experience as this psychologist describes.

Besides, no person can actually inspect with any of his senses the physical process here depicted. What we do experience is a *psychical emotion* following a perception. If I see a beautiful flower, I experience esthetic mental pleasure; not a physical process involving the action of neurones, glands and the rest. But even if the supposed physical process is a fact, there must be a mind which is so constituted as to be *conscious* of the results of the process.

2. RELATION TO THE INTELLECT.

Each perception or other action of the Intellect stirs its corresponding emotion. It is a complex and mysterious process. The perception of the Intellect creates an emotion,

and then the Intellect in turn perceives, or becomes conscious of, the emotion. This is not speculation; it is experience.

A courteous friend suggests the following: "There might be emotional disturbance without perception, for the emotions, being under the control of the autonomic system, are outside of the immediate control of consciousness."

True; but that would not be a feeling in the sense of a *conscious* emotion. We doubt whether any disturbance of the nervous system that was not carried back to the self-conscious mind could be called an emotion in the psychical sense of the term. A nerve in one of the extremities might be lacerated never so much; if its connection with the brain were destroyed, no pain would be experienced.

Does perception always go before feeling or emotion? This may be only an academic question, and of little practical value; yet, in the interest of clear thinking, we believe this may be said: an effect on the body or mind must first be impinged upon the perceiving self before it can be regarded as a psychical emotion. As long as an effect even on the body is not conveyed to the conscious mind, no emotion is aroused; but when the connection with the cognizing self is intact, a feeling will always result. We can have no experience save in the field of our self-consciousness. I must know that *I* am *I*, or *I* cannot know that it is *I* who has the experience. Let us not try to play hide with ourselves. We shall very likely have to put up with ourselves and live with ourselves throughout the eternity to come. Of course, for those who are in tune with the Infinite, this will be no hardship, but a great and glorious experience.

3. CLASSES OF EMOTIONS.

(1) *Sentient Emotions.*

These emotions correspond with the sense perceptions,

as classified under sight, hearing, taste, etc. Our experience tells us that they are of various kinds, such as pleasant and unpleasant. They are also of various degrees of intensity. Some feelings might almost be called "drab"—that is, almost neutral, and therefore not very clear in the consciousness. At other times they are intense, and make us either very joyful or very sorrowful.

A valued friend, a teacher of psychology, offers the following suggestions, which are included here for their scientific value from the physiological viewpoint: "At present pleasantness and unpleasantness are not classed under the emotions, but are related to the state and operations of the neurones. Thorndike holds feeling to be the result of action or restraint when the neurones are ready or unready to act. Thus, neurones ready to act: action pleasant, restraint unpleasant; neurones not ready to act: action unpleasant, restraint pleasant."

Very well; that kind of speculation may be true to the facts for all we know; still, the conscious mind is there, and must be there, to realize the pleasantness or the unpleasantness of the result of the process. If the conscious mind were not there, it would all be a matter of the action or non-action of the neurones. Can neurones be conscious of feeling? On the other hand, can the *mind* be conscious of feeling? The questions answer themselves.

Moreover, Thorndike's view is highly theoretical and speculative. No one can get into the inner part of a human being's body and actually watch the behavior of those marvelous neurones while he is having an emotion. But the *mind* can and does realize the emotion. No; the psychologists cannot account for a single experience of the mind without the mind itself, any more than you could have an

affection of the neurones without the neurones. There must always be *a something there*.

(2) *Intuitive Emotions.*

These emotions are of a higher order than those that arise merely from the action of the senses. Too many psychologists today stop with sensational psychology. We need to think on higher levels than mere animal and corporeal experiences.

The intuitive emotions, as the term indicates, are connected with man's immediate perceptions of reality and are of various kinds and of various degrees of intensity. Mention may be made of the sex feeling, the esthetic, moral and theistic feelings, and the feelings regarding truth and error.

On these important matters the Bible is both a corrective and an incentive. When our emotions are wrong the teaching of the Bible tends to inhibit them. On the other hand, that teaching stimulates the right kind of feelings, those of love, kindness, true joy, and aspirations for high ideals.

(3) *Psychical Emotions.*

These emotions are connected with the Understanding. We may think of the pleasures and pains of reflection, association, memory, imagination, reasoning, etc. How richly the cultivated mind is capacitated for varied feelings!

Here Christianity is of great value both as an incentive and a corrective. Sinful feeling should be elided from the mind; right feeling should be cherished and cultivated. Reflection on the love of God, the glory of the gospel, the prospects of a heavenly inheritance,—all these stir within us the holiest and loftiest feelings of joy and gratitude. They help to transfigure life, and if universally cherished, in connection with the proper rational background and basis, they would presently re-Edenize the world.

As an item of applied psychology, we may add that the right kind of emotions should be cultivated, because it is not likely that man could act worthily at all if he were not actuated by motives of joy and hope—that is, man without feeling would not be man. On the other hand, men should not be too emotional either in religion or in other modes of life. The feelings are intended to furnish us motive power and incentive, but are not to be the ultimate guide of our conduct. Here we need the intellect, the judgment, the reason, the conscience; above all, the Word and Spirit of God. Proper emotion is all right; emotionalism is an extreme. In religion the latter will lead to fanaticism and radicalism.

III. THE WILL.

1. DEFINITION.

The Will is the self-determining power of the mind. Further definitions are: The mind's ability of alternate choice; the autonomy of the Self.

2. THEORIES OF THE WILL.

(1) *Determinism* is the view that the will is not in any degree free; that it is bound or absolutely determined by various influences, like heredity, environment, bodily organization, neurones, glands, motives, etc. This view is also known as necessitarianism.

This is a most perilous doctrine. One university professor recently declared that no one could be a scientist unless he was a determinist in psychology. He went further and averred that no one is responsible for his conduct; even the criminals of our country cannot help behaving as they do! It requires no strain on one's imagination to foresee what would become of society, government and civilization if such crass and pernicious ideas were to become prevalent.

Destroy the sense of responsibility in man and you destroy character. It is the duty of Christian people to deepen and accentuate the feeling of responsibility among the people. If we cannot do otherwise, we should shame people into something more stalwart and heroic than to look upon themselves as mere dead leaves tossed in the wind. We should tell them plainly that the excuse, "I couldn't help it," is the whimper of a weakling. Suggest to the youth that he ought to be a man, not a manikin. Point out to him that he is not an automaton or robot, but a moral agent, and that he ought to remember his dignity and responsibility.

(2) *Indeterminism* is the opposite extreme, holding that man is determined by nothing but his own capricious will and pleasure. This view is little less harmful than determinism. Experience teaches all men that there are many things they cannot do. It is simply rational to accept the fact that we are finite and dependent beings. It is most fortunate that limited beings do not have unlimited freedom.

3) *Libertarianism* is the view that the will is free within its divinely prescribed limits; that man is not a mere automaton; that he has liberty in many ways, and especially that he is a free moral agent.

Everywhere the Bible is on the side of the libertarian view. It always treats man as a free agent, or offers to convert him into one. In this respect the teaching of Christianity is well-poised. It does not regard or treat man as if he had unlimited power and freedom, and yet deals with him as a being who has all the power of choice needed to develop the noblest kind of character and life.¹

1. For a fuller development and vindication of the libertarian view, cf. the author's books, *A System of General Ethics*, pp. 112-128; *A Manual of Christian Ethics*, pp. 57, 63-67. For a masterly discussion on the striking theme, "Men or Robots," see William McDougall in *Psychologies for 1925*, pp. 273-305.

However, Christianity has a distinct contribution to make to the doctrine of the Will of which General Psychology knows little or nothing. We refer to the regeneration of the will, in order to enable it to function in a spiritual way. We have already seen that man in the natural state is, so far as regards spiritual ability, "dead in trespasses and sins," as the Scripture teaches. Says Paul, "I am persuaded that in me, that is, in my flesh, there dwelleth no good thing." Here, as elsewhere, Paul uses the term "flesh" in the sense of the natural or carnal nature. At another place he exclaims: "Oh, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" And again: "The carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Our Lord also taught this doctrine: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," and, "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." It is the same doctrine of spiritual corruption and disability which the Psalmist so sorely lamented: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Ps. 51: 5).

When man fell in the garden of Eden, he lost the image of original righteousness in which he was created, and thus his will became enslaved so far as regards spiritual achievements. Man can in nowise set himself free from this bondage. He may rebel against God, but he cannot save himself. Therefore Christ came to carry out the divine and pre-determined plan of redemption in man's behalf. This being done, so that all the obstructions to the free course of saving love were removed, God could work freely and ethically, and send the Holy Spirit, operating through the Word of God, to awaken, enlighten and regenerate man, and thus deliver his will from its servitude to sin, and re-enable it to function in a spiritual and truly ethical manner. All this

has been set forth more fully in our analysis of the Order of Salvation. But it should be emphasized here, because this kind of conversion is peculiar to Christianity, and so constitutes one of the reasons why it should be broadcasted throughout the world. A world that lies in wickedness needs to be touched and empowered by just such a saving dynamic.

3. THE UNIQUE POWERS OF THE WILL.

(1) *The Power of Attention.*

Man can pay heed; concentrate his thoughts; focus his mind on a specific subject or object by an effort of his will. This ability of the mind is recognized in the Bible whenever it says: "Take ye heed," "Look unto me, all ye ends of the earth," "Hear ye Him," "Think on these things," "Give attendance to reading."

(2) *The Power of Choice.*

In his normal state man can choose between two paths, between two vocations, between good and evil. While this power of alternate choice is mysterious when we try to analyze it, yet it is a matter of individual and universal experience; therefore to recognize and accept it as a fact is both scientific and practical—scientific because it is based on empiricism; practical because individual and social life as we know it is possible only by a recognition of the fact that man has the power to choose and is responsible for the right or wrong use of that power.

On this point, as in the others, the teaching of the Bible is in accord with general human experience. It builds on the basis that man has the power of alternate choice. "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve" (Josh. 24:15); "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing;

therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live" (Deut. 30:19); "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow Him; but if Baal, then follow him" (1 Kings 18:21); "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life" (John 5:40); "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wing, and ye would not" (Matt. 23:37; Luke 13:34). Indeed, God's treatment of our first parents in the garden, when He placed before them the forbidden tree, implies their free moral agency, their power of choice.

(3) *The Power of Execution.*

There seems to be still one more movement of the mind necessary to complete the process of freedom. The attention given and the choice (decision) made, the will is able to carry the mind's verdict into action. That man has such an ability is a matter of every-day experience. In his own mind he experiences the putting forth of energy at the very point where he makes the effort to carry out the choice he has previously made. Here again we have pure empirical psychology; not a speculative attempt to explain experience on a mere physical basis.

Biblical psychology everywhere takes for granted the mind's power to execute its decisions, because it ever treats him as a free agent. "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them" (John 13:17); "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God who worketh in you both to will and to do His good pleasure" (Phil. 2:12, 13). This last quotation is a most significant one for psychology: it indicates the divine source of spiritual power, and then exhorts man to use the communicated ability. It also points out the urgent incentive for such exer-

tion, saying it comes from God's good work in the soul. All this process agrees with Christian experience: God gives the ability; it behooves man to use that ability.

4. THE WILL IN ACTION.

(1) *Through the Senses.*

It is a matter of experience that the will can, in large measure, control and direct the use of the senses. Just a little analytical introspection will make this plain. You can in many cases look or decline to look at an object or a person. Suppose you are looking out of your library window at the lawn, the garden, the birds, the trees. Suddenly an object appears within the range of your vision at which it would be wrong for you to look—surely you would be able to turn your eyes away. The same is true of hearing: it is right for you to listen to sweet music, uplifting discourse, instructive conversation; but it is wrong for you to listen to obscene stories and suggestions. In the former case you voluntarily listen; in the latter you decline to listen.

Let us note the Biblical implications on this physico-mental ability: "Look not thou upon the wine when it is red within the cup" (Prov. 23:31); "And touch not the unclean thing" (2 Cor. 6:17); "Take heed how ye hear;" "Take heed what ye hear;" "Touch not, taste not, handle not."

(2) *Through the Intuitions.*

In the experience of self-consciousness the will has some freedom through attention and introspection. You and I can make ourselves think of ourselves in a very definite way and an intensified degree. On the other hand, many times we become absorbed in other matters, and "forget ourselves." In respect to such intuitions as the cognition of

outward reality, truth and error, right and wrong, etc., all of us are aware that we have a considerable degree of freedom. We can at least in part control and guide these intuitions and modify their degree of intensity, and if we have the mind to do so, we can place them in the field of the understanding, and reason about them, as was seen in a preceding section.

Here the Bible may again be brought forward as recognizing and calling into activity these powers of the mind: "Take heed unto thyself and to the doctrine;" "Ye shall know the truth;" "Their conscience also bearing witness" (Rom. 2:15). All these and many more passages plainly connoting a degree of liberty in the use of the natural intuitions. Plainly, therefore, Christianity involves all the diverse powers of the human mind, at least in potential form.

(3) Through the Understanding.

It is just as obvious that the will is able, in a large measure, to control and guide the various activities of the Understanding—Reflection, Imagination, Memory, Association, Perception, Hope, Faith, etc. This, we think, needs no further development, for if man is free in the other respects named, it follows logically that he must be free in the exercise of the activities of the Understanding. In no respect is man a mere cat's-paw of circumstances. He can largely modify and mold them to his own purposes.

On this point the Bible again strikes a clear note: "Think on these things;" "I will meditate on thy Word;" "The people imagine a vain thing;" "Son, remember;" "Remember now thy Creator;" "Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom, and with all thy getting, get understanding;" "Prove all things; hold fast to that which is

good;" "He perceived that they reasoned among themselves;" "When he came to himself, he said;" "I applied my heart to know and to search and to seek out wisdom, and the reason of things" (Eccl. 7:25). Here is an attempt to philosophize. Besides, when Solomon investigated the flowers and the animals, he also displayed the tendency of the inquiring mind to engage in scientific research.

We have now carried this part of our studies as far as seems to be advisable. It is true, many of the topics are capable of much further development. It may also occur that some important points have been omitted. If the latter alternative should have occurred, the student should supplement his knowledge by the study of other authors.

It may be of value to summarize our findings along one line, the presentation of which has been one of the major purposes of this volume. At all points where Biblical teaching and empirical observation meet and touch each other there is perfect integration; no elements of discord have arisen. Our conclusion is that, while the Bible does not, as has been said, present a science of psychology in technical and systematic form, it does present the fundamental psychological data that may be arranged into a system which comports with the valid findings of empirical psychology. These facts ought to stir gratitude in the Christian soul. They ought, as well, to make a cogent appeal to men who deal only with general or secular psychology.

PART IV APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY

CHAPTER X

I. WHY A BRIEF TREATMENT.

1. OUR WORK ONLY A HANDBOOK.

The purpose of this book is to present only a concise treatment of the fundamental principles of General and Christian Psychology, with only such details as are necessary to a correct understanding. To enter into minutæ as to the practical application of psychology to the various phases of human life and experience would swell the book to such large proportions as to defeat its primary purpose.

2. MUCH APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY ALREADY PRESENTED.

As we have touched upon the various phases of man's mental life, we have had occasion again and again to indicate the practical value of their investigation. The best method of applying this knowledge has frequently been suggested, because our interest has not been merely academic. To go into details now would involve a good deal of repetition.

3. LET EACH ONE MAKE HIS OWN APPLICATION.

Students and others do not always need to be shown just how things are to be done. Instruct them in the right principles, and their common-sense will often tell them how to make the practical application.

4. OTHER WORKS DEAL WITH PRACTICE.

Quite a number of valuable books deal with the practical phases of psychology. Their authors have had much experience in applying its principles. Some have been engaged in social work; others in teaching in the departments of religious education and in what is known in the colleges and universities as "experimental psychology" by the use of laboratory methods. These works may be used for reference and supplementary reading and study.

However, it may be well to add a few paragraphs by way of practical application.

II. SOME PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS.

1. RELIGIOUS VALUE OF THIS STUDY.

The singular agreement between empirical and Biblical psychology has been discovered in our investigations at every vital point. The system of truth and salvation set forth so impressively in the Bible has been seen to fit into all man's psychical needs. It would seem as if that system and man's mind were designedly made for each other. There is teleology at every step.

Such findings are strengthening to Christian faith. They afford comfort and uplift to the Christian in his life. They furnish an added stimulus to his work in bringing others to an experience of truth and salvation. The earnest Christian psychologist can hardly help being a soul-winner.

2. OUR STUDY CORRECTIVE AND CONSTRUCTIVE.

By understanding the principles and workings of our minds better, we are better able to correct our faults and to strengthen our virtues. In this way our characters and lives will be heightened. Much is said now-a-days about "life." Much of the talk, we must confess, sounds point-

less and extremely general. However, to make the matter more specific and concrete, our lives may be greatly enriched by the proper study of our mental powers and activities, combined with an increasing knowledge of the gospel of Christ. In this way we shall enlarge our intellectual, ethical and spiritual experiences and assets; all of which will help us to achieve the "life more abundant," which our Lord promises to those who know and trust Him. This activity of the mind in right lines will prevent us from merely vegetating.

3. THE ALTRUISTIC VIEWPOINT..

A better knowledge of human mentality will enable us to be more helpful to others. We can see into their minds, as it were, and realize their need and read their motives. In this way our contacts with our fellowmen will be ordered with better judgment. We shall not use the hit-or-miss plan—a method that leads to constant blundering, and may do others permanent harm. Many a mistake has been made by perfectly sincere persons because they were unwise in their psychological approach to those whom they desired to help. Psychological expertness will lead to greater care and better judgment.

Our teaching, our preaching, our service in general, will be better adapted to the needs of the people if we master the principles of mental action and reaction. No two persons are temperamentally alike; so it behooves the Christian and social worker to be something of a mind-reader. A little application of psycho-analysis will be found to be beneficial, if good judgment is exercised.

4. THE NEED OF DIVINE ASSISTANCE.

Our studies have shown us that we need the help of God's grace, if we would live on the highest level. In view of our

congenital sinfulness, we are unable in our natural state to attain the best life. Our wills are more or less enchain'd, and need to be liberated. Our emotions and motives are corrupted, and need to be cleansed.

Moreover, it stands to reason that we cannot live on the highest levels and attain to the highest values without contact with the highest Being, the ultimate Personality, the Creator, Sustainer and Redeemer of the universe. If we know that He is, and that He is a God who loves us to the point of self-immolation, as is manifest in the plan of redemption through Christ, then certainly to trust, love and serve Him will greatly enhance and uplift our souls. In this respect Christian psychology and theology are of much practical benefit in transfiguring human life.

5. CULTIVATION OF THE FACULTIES.

We have learned that life can be greatly enriched by the cultivation of the various powers of the mind. The refinement of the senses is an excellent exercise, and adds much to life's values. To fill and occupy the mind with good and uplifting thoughts increases life's assets. It will prove a great blessing to us throughout life if in our youth we store the memory with wholesome truths, apt aphorisms, choice adages and epigrams, inspiring facts about nature, man and God, and hopes and aspirations that do not make ashamed. The pleasures of the imagination also enhance the values of life. Men live richer lives, too, when they study science, philosophy and theology.

Not all people are so situated in life that they can enjoy these advantages, but all persons should cultivate and enrich their minds as much as possible, so as to prevent life from growing humdrum and their hearts from becoming morbid and nauseated with monotony.

6. THE USE AND CULTURE OF THE WILL.

No teacher has a right to treat children as if they were blocks of wood or pieces of mechanism. Their wills and consciences should be recognized, spurred into activity, developed in strength and firmness. Not too rapidly, it is true, but with wise progressiveness, the parent and teacher should awaken and develop the sense of responsibility in children, so that they may form the habit in early life of using their wills in right actions and choices. Never give them the impression that they cannot do right and cannot help doing wrong.

The professor in a college or university who teaches determinism to his students is guilty of unpsychological, unscientific and unethical conduct. He has no right to impose such teaching on the young minds of the country, and thus help to break down the *morale* of our civilization. He is committing an unscientific act, because all his students, as well as himself, know in their consciousness that they are not mere mechanisms and robots. They realize in their inmost minds that they are responsible beings.

Moreover, what would happen to our civilization if everybody believed himself to be an irresponsible creature and would act accordingly? No; the doctrine of determinism is not practical. No man can live according to its principles, and no social organism could endure under its regime.

7. THE MINDS OF CHILDREN.

Many things might be said to parents and teachers regarding the training of children. There is such a thing as child psychology. The little child is a bundle of instincts, impulses and intuitions. His rational, ethical and religious principles must be developed later. A good thing to do is to remember that we older people once were children, and

to go back as far as possible in our childhood. Too many adults seem to forget that they once were children. Hence they do not know how to treat children.

The child mind is impressionable. It is well for parents and teachers to be careful what kind of impressions they make on the children's plastic minds. Some of us suffer more or less today from certain evil impressions that were made on our minds in early childhood.

To be illgrained toward little children is most unwise. Think of the reaction on a child's mind when its parent scolds it angrily for what it knows it did innocently. By a kind of intuition it will feel the injustice of the treatment.

Much is made today by teachers in schools of religion for children of the method of story-telling. This method is, to a considerable extent, based on psychological principles, for, no doubt, most children are arrested and held by a story, while it is hard for them to focus their attention on more abstract things. Yet we think that the story-telling method may be overdone. The children should also be taught truth and reality. They should not be allowed to think that all life is made up of fanciful incidents. At quite an early age they should be taught to distinguish between truth and fiction. Young children ask, "Is that a true story?" They distinguish between a true story and one that is only "made up."

8. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ADOLESCENCE.

Much has been written on this subject, and much of it is of great practical value. But we cannot enlarge on the subject here. The experiences of youth are more or less unique—that is, peculiar to that age. The boy is hardly a boy or a man; the girl is hardly a girl or a woman. With many youths it is an uncomfortable and embarrassing age. They

experience a struggle to orient themselves, to adjust themselves to this condition.

The treatment of youth should be in accord with their peculiar mental status. Two suggestions may be made to parents and teachers. First, they should have close association with the young folks, so that they may know directly how they feel and of what they are thinking. Second, they should try to remember their own peculiar experiences during their own adolescent period. Then they will not become so impatient with the foibles of young people. They will treat them with sympathy. It is a good thing for the father to be a chum with his sons, and the mother to be an older sister to her girls. A like principle will hold respecting the relation of teachers to their pupils. The fathers' and sons' banquets which are often held in our Christian churches today are a good movement.

9. THE FORMATION OF HABIT.

In reviewing our work, we find that we have made no place for habit. It is doubtful whether we can rightly call habit a faculty or activity of the mind. It seems rather to be a state or disposition.

Perhaps habit might be defined as the innate tendency of man, in the totality of his being, to become fixed in certain ways of thinking and acting through repetition. Some of Webster's definitions are as follows: "Mental or moral constitution or bearing;" "The disposition or prevailing character of one's thoughts and feelings;" "A particular aptitude or settled disposition;" "Especially an aptitude or inclination for some action, acquired by frequent repetition and showing itself in increased facility of performance or decreased power of resistance."

Habit formation may pertain mostly to the body or mostly

to the mind, or may be about equally divided between them. Certain habits, like drinking or smoking, or lustful indulgence, pertain mostly to man's physical organism. The habit of cherishing envy or worldly ambition belongs predominantly to the mind. Convivial habits may perhaps belong about equally to both body and mind, because the social part of man's nature is often involved almost as much as his love of eating and drinking.

It may well be said that habit makes character. You and I are what we habitually think and do. It is all-important, therefore, that we take into consideration this inherent tendency of character to become fixed. It means that we cannot treat ourselves just as we please, for if we do a wrong thing once, it may be easier to do it the next time; and thus by repetition a habit may be formed which cannot be readily broken, or which may grip us in its stranglehold throughout our lives. This is especially true of the use of opiates and intoxicating beverages and the indulgence of the lascivious appetencies. The same, however, may be said of indulging in vain, jealous and covetous feelings.

On the other hand, we should recognize the blessing that lies in this fixing tendency of character and action. If we indulge in good thoughts, the mind will soon become habituated along that line. The same is true if we perform good deeds. Even the body, by means of its reflex powers, can be trained to do very difficult things by constant practice and repetition, as, for example, playing on musical instruments. Of course, there must be some natural gift to be cultivated, but if it is there, it can be almost indefinitely developed.

If it were not for this habituating tendency of mind and body, life would become too great a task and would crush us. Think for a moment: if we had to make the same ef-

fort all through life to walk or talk that was required when we first attempted to do these things, how onerous, yes, how impossible, living and acting would be! There can be no doubt that character-fixing and habit-fixing are providential arrangements, to make life durable and new achievements possible.

It is all-important to form good habits, so that we may do good deeds more and more easily; as it were, more and more spontaneously. There is the habit of regular church-going. Some superficial people scoff at such a habit, and declare that the regular attendant on the means of grace worships God "by rote," or "merely as a matter of habit." Clearer thought on the subject, however, will show the objector to be wrong. Suppose church-going and acts of worship were a constant strain and burden, instead of an easy and pleasurable service through habit, would such laborious exercise be more acceptable to Him who "looketh upon the heart"?

Instead, therefore, of being hypercritical of people who do the right thing readily and spontaneously, because in previous years they have developed their characters along right lines, let us be thankful to a kind Providence for so constituting our natures that they do become settled into right dispositions and actions. And above all, let us take advantage of this tendency within us, and form the right kind of habits of thought and action. Let us learn to do the right easily as we go along through life, "still achieving, still pursuing," ever making new conquests.

Is habit-formation recognized in the Holy Scriptures? We may be assured that such a psychological experience has not been overlooked by the inspired writers: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil" (Jer.

13:23); "Cease to do evil; learn to do well" (Isa. 1:16 17); "Ponder the path of thy feet, and let thy ways be established" (Prov. 4:26); "For it is a good thing that the heart be established with grace" (Heb. 13:9); "Be established in the present truth" (2 Pet. 1:12); "My heart is fixed, O God, my heart is fixed: I will sing and give praise" (Ps. 57:7); "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong" (1 Cor. 16:13); "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage" (Gal. 1:1).

10. PSYCHOLOGY FOR PREACHERS.¹

At this point we tread on quaking ground, because so much might be said, and yet we feel our incompetency to give advice. Yet we cannot help believing that the proper study of real psychology will be of vast benefit to the minister of the gospel in both his preaching and his pastoral work. Of course, the study of the speculative psychologies of the day will profit him little, especially the psychology of the mechanistic and monistic order; but the study of real mental dispositions and tendencies will be most helpful to him.

If he has been able to take the measurement of the average human mind, he will be likely to know what will arrest and hold attention. He will, therefore, proclaim the truths of the gospel in the most appealing way. One trouble with a good deal of preaching is its prosiness; it fails to stir the thought and to focus the attention. Other things being equal, people will always be interested if you tell them something new, something they did not know before about the Bible and religion, and yet something that they feel to be

1. For a valuable and elaborate discussion of this important theme, see C. S. Gardner, *Psychology and Preaching*.

worth knowing. The truths set forth must be vital, gripping, livable, and the manner of presenting them must be vivacious. The over-long sermon is a sin against psychological principles; but the lavender perfumed sermonette is no less so. People want a real worth-while sermon, as a rule, but they do not want too much of a good thing at a time.

The author is persuaded that the discussion of secular matters in the Christian pulpit on Sunday is a psychological mistake. Why? Because it is irrelevant in the house of God, and most Christian people will feel its irrelevancy. They go to church to hear the gospel, to listen to religious discourse. They are dealing with secular matters all the days of the week. On Sunday they want a change. That is part of the psychology of the spiritual sermon. The other part is this: If people want to be religious, they want to have some time and opportunity to cultivate their spiritual nature. They are busy otherwise during the week. If they must listen to secular discussions on Sunday at the hour of worship, they naturally wonder when and how they are going to have a chance to grow in grace and in the knowledge of Christ.

There is nothing that so fits the needy human soul as the message of the gospel. Therefore the minister is standing on firm psychological ground when he preaches the pure gospel and applies it to the needs of sinful men. By doing this kind of preaching faithfully and earnestly he will help to fit men for "the life that now is and that which is to come" (1 Tim. 4:8). That is applying the principles of true Christian Psychology.

ADDENDUM I

O. M. NORLIE'S PSYCHOLOGY

In order to set forth the data of Christian Psychology somewhat more fully, and to acquaint the student with a somewhat different method of treatment and a somewhat different terminology, a partial outline of Dr. Norlie's work, *An Elementary Christian Psychology*, is presented below. Although we have used our own method of notation, the topics are all presented in Dr. Norlie's serial order, and his nomenclature is used.

I. PSYCHOLOGY AND THE SOUL.

1. PSYCHOLOGY.

- (1) Definition: The science of the soul.
- (2). Value: For practical and scientific purposes.

2. THE ESSENTIAL PARTS OF MAN.

- (1) The body (dealt with quite fully afterward).
- (2) The soul.
- (3) The body and soul in conjunction.

II. RELATION OF BODY AND SOUL (the mind-body problem).

1. WRONG VIEWS (Idealism, Materialism, etc.).
2. THE RIGHT VIEW (Dualism and Interaction).

III. PHYSICAL FOUNDATIONS.

1. THE HEART.

2. THE HEAD (treated quite fully and technically).

IV. PSYCHICAL FOUNDATIONS.

1. CONSCIOUSNESS.
2. ATTENTION.

V. THE MENTAL FACULTIES.

1. KNOWING.
 - (1) Presentation.
 - a. Intuition; b. Sensation; c. Perception.
 - (2) Representation.
 - a. Association; b. Memory; c. Imagination.
 - (3) Thinking.
 - a. Conception; b. Judging; c. Reasoning.
2. FEELING.
3. WILLING.
4. CONSCIENCE.
5. FAITH.
 - (1) Psychology of; (2) Analysis; (3) Classification;
 - (4) Value.

VI. ADDITIONAL TOPICS.

1. THE NATURAL AND RENEWED STATES OF MAN.
2. LEARNING (its basis, process, etc.).
3. CHILDHOOD AND YOUTH.
4. THE SELF (well treated).

ADDENDUM II

GESTALT PSYCHOLOGY

By PROFESSOR CARL O. SCHNEIDER, Ph. D.¹

Gestalt Psychology (Psychology of Configuration) is the strongest action against all mechanistic and atomistic psychology. The name indicates that this psychology is based upon the experiences of shapes. Here we find clearly the fact that, as Wundt—the forerunner of this psychology, which today is mainly represented in the schools of F. Krueger, Leipzig, and W. Koehler, Berlin—says: the mental total experience is more than all its parts.

This axiom shows at first the difference between all mental and all physiological facts. All material processes follow the *additiv* principle: the whole is always the sum of all its parts. The Gestaltists claim that such additions are not possible in mental processes. When I see, for example, six dots, I do not experience them as six sensations which, by some way of perceptive or associate mechanism, become connected to a sum-total. That is an unjustified naturalistic interpretation which does not correspond to the results of all the experimentations which show that our first experience is a total experience of a whole, a shape, a configuration.

From this principle the second axiom of the Gestaltists follows: the whole is always before all the parts (of course

1. This presentation was written by Dr. Schneider at the author's request. At this writing Dr. Schneider is a professor of psychology and philosophy at Wittenberg College and Hamma Divinity School.

only mentally). This total experience is a peculiar "creative synthesis," a creative total act in which our whole mental totality takes some part. Therefore all our mental experiences are highly complicated at the beginning; they are mental complex experiences which we notice as "complex qualities."

When we look at the above-mentioned six dots, we have at first a very complicated total quality of "diffusiveness," or of configuration always containing dispositionally infinite factors of our mental life. The more total these experiences are, the more they have a feeling tone for the experiencing one. There is no complex quality without a feeling; and, *vice versa*, there are as many feelings as there are complex experience, i. e., infinite.

Therefore Gestalt Psychology rejects all schematic classification of the structuralistic kind (pleasantness, unpleasantness, etc.). At the same time emphasis is placed upon the affective life as the background of all mental experiences. But those first total-complex experiences, in which affective, intellectual and many other experiences are so united in one whole that it is impossible to separate them in any analytical way, now begin to undergo an organizing process (*Durchgliederung*).

This original dispositional tendency to shape unorganized complexes more and more is the main dynamic quality of our mental life. The Gestaltists call it "desire to shape" (*Gestaltungsdrang*), "will to form," etc. This forming, organizing process begins to arrange the first confused experiences into two possibilities: either it is a process of arrangement, when the complex experience goes over into an experience of an *organized* shape; or it is a process of exclusion (*Ausgliederung*), when parts of the complex are

omitted, excluded; the dominance of the whole is overcome by the dominance of a part.

Take again the six dots: in the first case the first complex experience changes to the experience of all kinds of inner organizations of the figure: we do not see a rectangle any more, but a rectangle with diagonals or a cross figure. This changing can repeat itself without changing the stimulus; it is again a synthetic creative, shape-forming experience as an organizing process.

In the second case, this process excludes five of the dots; that is, we do not have any mental experiences except the quality of one dot. In no case does the exclusion go so far that we get a simple sensation; at least, an affective quality of the whole, a simple feeling, is given with every, even the most excluded, experience.

But the less excluding a process is, the more total, the deeper and richer the total qualities of experience are. The deepest and most total processes include the total fullness and richness of inner experiences even in bipolar and contrasting qualities. We have such highly complicated total qualities, for example, in the deepest esthetic and religious experiences, in the multi-dimensionality and contrasting polarity (*Gegensaetzlichkeit*) of the emotions (in religious experiences, for example, the contrast of fear-and-love qualities in one experience).

ADDENDUM III

IS MAN A DICHOTOMY OR A TRICHOTOMY?

A few more words need to be said relative to the question here raised. It was overlooked while the text was in process of preparation. An erudite friend of the author holds that man is a trichotomy, but his view is not that of the usual tripartite theory, namely, that man is composed of body, soul and spirit.

In biology he is a sincere vitalist, holding that physical life is a real entelechy (Aristotle's term) or entity, and not merely a principle or force. If the author of this work were a convinced vitalist, he, too, would hold the trichotomistic view, which would mean that man is composed of matter, life and mind; for here would be three distinct entities.

The author confesses that he has no serious objection to this theory, and is not aware that anything of practical value depends upon solving the problem. Surely physical life is something that is added to dead material substance, and something, too, that greatly changes its quality and action, enabling it to make chemical and other transformations that are entirely unknown in the purely mineral realm. Life grows and increases quantitatively by the mitotic division of the cells—a process that is entirely absent from the domain of dead matter. Hence, judged by its phenomena, life seems to be a real noumenon or entity.

Yet many biologists reject the vitalistic view, although just now it seems to be having a resurgence. There is one

objection to the tripartite view built on the vitalistic theory that has some bearing on religion and theology. If man is constituted of three entities, namely, matter, life and mind, then, when he dies, one of them, that is, life, seems utterly to perish, while the other two continue to exist, the body as to its substance; and the soul in the disembodied state. But does any real entity or substance ever become annihilated? It still seems to the author, therefore, that the dualistic view of man is the best authenticated view both from a Biblical and a scientific standpoint.

ADDENDUM IV

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Some of the most relevant treatises are here cited. The list is not meant to be exhaustive. The added remarks in each case are intended to give the reader a general conception of the basic character of the book in question. We hope this attempt will prove stimulating. The author frankly indicates the chief points on which he feels compelled to differ from the positions of some of the writers. Some works that seem to be wrong in some respects may be very valuable and informing in others. In these days of psychological speculation the student must learn to discriminate. Our roster is hereby submitted.

AMES, EDWARD S.: "The Psychology of Religious Experience."

This is an elaborate work; but too liberalistic in religion for the evangelical believer—too much disposed to attribute religious experience to merely natural causes.

ANGELL, J. R.: "Psychology" (third edition, revised; 1905).

We do not know whether this work is considered out of date or not, but it seems to us to deal with pure empirical psychology more distinctively and effectively than do many of the more recent publications, which are all too prone to indulge in speculations on man's bodily functions, and thus essay to explain all mental phenomena on a purely physical basis.

ANNETT, E. A.: "Psychology for Bible Teachers" (1925).

An excellent little book; simple in style, yet informing in content. The editors of the series to which the book belongs are liberalists in theology; but the book itself seems throughout to uphold true Christian Psychology. The author is in earnest religiously.

BAKER, A. E.: "Psychoanalysis Explained and Criticized" (1927).

The author does precisely what his title indicates: he explains the Freudian psychology, frankly admits the truth in it and its practical value in some cases, and then points out effectively its faults and errors. It is an English work.

BERMAN, LOUIS: "The Religion Called Behaviorism" (1927).

This book is a keen critique on Behaviorism, and as such we recommend it; but it is not only non-Christian, but anti-Christian, for which cause we cannot approve it. The religion which the author proposes to substitute for Christianity is certainly hazy enough, and will never redeem the world.

BUCKHAM, JOHN W.: "Personality and Psychology" (1924).

A valuable critique of monistic theories. Author liberal in theology, but cogent in advocating Dualism.

CALKINS, MARY W.: "A First Book in Psychology" (fourth revised edition, 1921).

As long as the author is empirical, her work is clear and valuable. Her speculations are not so effective.

COE, GEORGE A.: "The Spiritual Life;" "The Religion of a Mature Mind."

Coe was another pioneer in this line of investigation.

CРАBB, CECIL V.: "Psychology's Challenge to Christianity" (1923).

Thoroughly evangelical. Deals effectively with monistic views. Indicates how Christianity may use all the valid results of psychological research.

DUNLAP, KNIGHT: "Mysticism, Freudianism and Scientific Psychology" (1920).

A cogent criticism of the first two views, especially Freudianism. Not so adequate in constructing a positive system; its author's position difficult to comprehend.

ELLIS, C. C.: "The Religion of Religious Psychology" (1922).

This brochure is an acute study of the religion of a number of leading psychologists, showing which are truly Christian and which are not. Authors like James, Starbuck, Coe, and Pratt are here analyzed.

GARDNER, CHARLES S.: "Psychology and Preaching" (1918).

A profound discussion; valuable for the minister; takes the dualistic viewpoint.

HUDSON, CYRIL E.: "Recent Psychology and the Christian Religion" (1923).

Instructive, but fails to connect up with vital and Biblical Christianity. Holds to man's animal ancestry; rejects the Biblical account of man's origin.

JAMES, WILLIAM: "Varieties of Religious Experience."

The author cites many concrete cases of religious experience, and adds his comments. An informing work, but ignores the supernatural too much to be classed as evangelical.

JOHNSON, W. H.: "Does the Behaviorist Have a Mind?" (*The Princeton Theological Review*, March, 1927).

This article is cited here because of its genuine value. On the negative side, it is a searching critique on Behaviorism; on the positive side, it stoutly upholds the reality of the mind as a component part of man's make-up.

KRETZMANN, P. E.: "Psychology and the Christian School" (1920).

This is a book that a teacher in a somewhat elementary Christian school can use with much satisfaction and effectiveness. It holds the true position, gives the basic facts in General Psychology, and is especially forceful in the part dealing with "Factors in Christian Education and Training."

MATTHEWS, W. R., and Others: "Psychology and the Church" (1925).

This is a notable book by five competent scholars. For the most part it is evangelical, treating Christianity as a supernatural religion and yet in accord with psychological data.

McDOUGALL, WILLIAM: "Outline of Psychology" (1924).

Valuable in that it advocates "purposive psychology," and thus approaches the Christian conception. However, it does not clearly advocate Dualism, and is too much occupied with animal instinct.

NORLIE, OLAF M.: "An Elementary Christian Psychology" (1924).

Thoroughly sound from the Christian viewpoint. Up-holds the reality of the soul as a distinct entity. Properly correlates mind and body in their interaction. In spite of the word "Elementary" the book is profound and technical

enough for advanced students. The Bibliography is extensive and of much value.

PRATT, JAMES B.: "Matter and Spirit" (1922).

A cogent argument for dualism by a psychologist of rare ability—"an avowed dualist and unashamed."

ROBACK, A. A.: "Behaviorism and Psychology" (1923).

An acute critique of monistic theories, especially Behaviorism. Perhaps not so successful in its constructive efforts.

ROOP, H. U.: "General Psychology: The Science of Mental Processes in Behavior" (1927).

As a work on General Psychology this is a thoroughly good treatise. It imparts just the information needed to lead to a clear understanding of mental processes. It is well adapted for textbook purposes in colleges. Dualism and Interaction are upheld by convincing arguments. The work lends much support to the Christian viewpoint.

SNOWDEN, JAMES H.: "The Psychology of Religion" (1916).

Evangelical and persuasive; rather wordy and rhetorical. Excellent for supplementary reading.

SPURR, FREDERIC C.: "The New Psychology and the Christian Faith" (1925).

This is a welcome addition to psychological literature. One might differ from several individual statements, but, on the whole, it is a successful effort to correlate supernatural experience and the attained results of scientific research. The errors of the New Psychology are clearly pointed out; the truths preserved and applied. The work is not a system, but a discussion of some of the vital topics pertaining to this discipline.

SQUIRES, W. A.: "Psychological Foundations of Religious Education" (1926).

This is a work that, for its special purpose, we can heartily recommend. The author upholds the Christian faith, and at the same time indicates how it fits into the constitution and needs of the human soul. The mechanistic and deterministic views come in for a full share of criticism, as they deserve.

STALKER, JAMES: "Christian Psychology."

This is an elementary work, and is thoroughly evangelical, but does not meet present needs, as it is an old work.

STARBUCK, EDWIN D.: "The Psychology of Religion."

The author was a "pioneer investigator." He used the questionnaire method. He dealt only with conversion.

STEVEN, GEORGE: "The Psychology of the Christian Soul" (1911); "The Development of the Christian Soul" (1917).

Informing and profound, but too liberalistic for truly Christian psychology. Education takes the place of regeneration.

STRICKLAND, FRANCIS L.: "Psychology of Religious Experience" (1924).

An informing work, but too naturalistic in explaining Christian experience. Fails to correlate Christian theology and Christian psychology; hence not thoroughly evangelical.

THOULESS, ROBERT H.: "An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion" (1923).

Most informing; exposes many present-day errors; but holds to the doctrine of "man's animal ancestry."

WATERHOUSE, E. S.: "An A B C of Psychology for Religious Education" (1927).

For those who desire to learn the fundamental principles of mental action, set forth in the simplest possible terms in view of the subject matter, this is the book to get and read. It is elementary, but sound in principle. The chapter on "Jesus as a Teacher" is excellent.

WILSON, G. A.: "The Self and its World" (1926).

While this profound presentation is not a treatise on formal psychology, yet it treats and upholds the pivotal matter in psychology, namely, the reality of the Self. We cannot agree with all the positions of the author, especially in his attitude toward evolution. If man came from an animal stock, it is difficult to figure out when he came into possession of real selfhood.

INDEX

- ABRAHAM'S BOSOM, (Paradise), 26.
- Adam and Eve, not "walking encyclopedias," 38; moral agents, 110.
- Adolescence, 144, 145.
- Adoption, certitude of, 55, 56.
- American Journal of Psychology, The*, 79, 92.
- Analysis of the human mind, 96-138.
- Anatomy, 17, 34.
- Animals, 10, 11, 37; created to be animals only, 74; their instincts, 102, 103.
- Annihilation, 62.
- Anthropomorphisms, 38.
- Anti-Christian theories, 64-77.
- Apologetics, Christian, 19, 22.
- Apperception, 93, 125.
- Applied psychology, 139-149.
- Association, 116, 125, 130, 137.
- Assurance of truth, 56, 57, 120.
- Atheists and agnostics, 53, 54.
- Atoms, 14, 87.
- Atonement, the, and psychology, 45-49.
- Attention, 134.
- Augsburg Confession, 43.
- Auto-suggestion, 76.
- Automata, 108.
- Awareness, 14, 69, 81.
- BAKER, A. E., 73, 158.
- Behaviorism, 13, 53, 67-71, 82, 88, 89, 91.
- Berman, L., 71, 94, 158.
- Bible, the (also Holy Scriptures, etc.), 10, 17, 21, 22, 35, 37; assurance of its truth, 56, 57; and science (psychical and otherwise), 63, 77, 78, 95-101, 105-107, 113-117, 130, 138.
- Biblical inspiration, 19, 22; terms (psychical), 30-35; doctrine of man, 36-62; Biblical and scientific psychology, 78-95.
- Biblical and scientific psychology correlated, 63-138.
- Body and mind, 14, 17, 18, 23-29, 40, 66, 101.
- Body, the, 30, 31; divinely fashioned, not evolved, 24, 39, 40.
- Brain, the, 13, 98.
- Breese, B. B., 101.
- Brightman, E. S., 64.
- Buckham, J. W., 69, 70, 73, 78, 158.
- CALKINS, M. W., 64, 101, 158.
- Child psychology, 143, 144.
- Christian experience: its psychology, 52-60; its content, 59, 60, 75, 120.
- Christianity, its Source Book, 21, 35, 37.
- Christ, the historical and Biblical, 21; His teaching, 25-27; assurance of truth in Him, 56.
- Choice, power of, 134, 135.
- Civil righteousness, 43.
- Conception and concept, 114.
- Conscience, 110.

- Consciousness and self-consciousness, 11, 65, 67, 74, 81-83, 91, 92, 96, 128, 129.
- Conversion, 51, 52, 134.
- Cosmos, the, 11.
- Crabb, E. V., 78, 116, 159.
- Creator and creation, 11, 14, 17, 23, 39, 53, 74, 92, 103, 107, 111, 123, 124, 142.
- DEFINITIONS:** of basic terms, 9-14; of anti-Christian theories, 64-67; of Dualism and Interact, 78; of *Gestalt Psychology*, 93; of Purposive Psychology, 94; of psychical terms, 97-132.
- Delitzsch, Franz, 27.
- Determinism, 131, 132, 143.
- Dichotomy, 23, 27-29, 155, 156.
- Dogmatics, Christian, 18, 22.
- Dorsey, G. A., 67.
- Double Aspect Theory, 66.
- Dualism, 18, 23-29, 33, 66, 67, 78-93, 95.
- Dunlap, Knight, 73, 159.
- EDWARDS, D. M.**, 64.
- Electrons, 14.
- Emotional religion, 75, 76, 131.
- Emotions, (sensibilities, feelings), 127-134; relation to the intellect, 127, 128.
- Empiricism, 14, 15, 41, 96, 103, 120, 128.
- Entelechy, 155.
- Entity, 9, 11-13, 16, 65, 66, 79, 91, 94, 112, 155, 156.
- Epistemology, 18.
- Eschatology and psychology, 60-62.
- Ethics, Christian, 18, 22.
- Etymology: of psychology, 9, 80; of faculty, 12.
- Evolution, 44, 73-75, 88, 124.
- Examples of the "plus sign," 82-89.
- Execution, power of, 135.
- Experience, 12, 14-16, 19, 52-60, 69, 71, 80-92, 96, 129, 134, 135.
- Experimental psychology, 13, 140.
- FACULTY**, a mental, 12, 38, 84; a good term, 12, 84; the scientific, 121, 122; the logical, 122; the philosophical, 123; the spiritual, 123, 124; cultivation of, 142.
- Fall, man's, 40-44.
- Faith, 118-120, 137.
- Feelings, the (see Emotions, Sensibilities).
- Fixism of type, 37, 38, 73, 74.
- Flesh, the, 31, 32.
- Formula of Concord, the, 43.
- Forsyth, P. T., 49.
- Free agency, 135.
- Freedom, human, 89, 137.
- Freudianism, 71-73.
- Future life, assurance of, 58, 59.
- GARDEN**, a, man's first habitat, 37.
- Gardner, C. S., 148, 159.
- Geneticism and heredity, 44.
- Gestalt Psychology*, 93, 94, 152-154.
- God, assurance of His existence, 53, 54.
- HABIT**, 145-148.
- Hades, 26.
- Heard, 27.
- Heart, the, 28, 29, 33, 35, 98, 101.
- Hindu *voga*, 59.
- Hodge, A. A., 49.

- Holy Spirit, the, in the Order of Salvation, 49-60; His witness, 51; and the body, 77; and the will, 50, 133, 134.
- Hope, 120, 127.
- Huxley, T., 88, 105.
- I, 11, 69, 104, 105, 113, 128.
- Idealistic psychology, 64, 65.
- Ihood, 105.
- Image, the divine in man, 23, 36, 38, 39, 42-44, 74, 133.
- Imagination, the, 117, 118, 130, 137.
- Incarcerationism, 76.
- Indeterminism, 132.
- Induction, 15.
- Instincts, the, 101-103.
- Intellect, the, 97-125.
- Interaction, 40, 67, 78-93.
- Introspection, 96, 112-114.
- Intuitions, the, 103-111; of outward reality, 104; of the self, 104, 105; of time and space, 106; of cause and effect, 106, 107; of truth and error, 107; of beauty and sublimity, 107, 108; of right and wrong, 108-110; of God, 110, 111; relations, 124, 125; the will and, 136, 137.
- JACOBS, H. E., 49.
- Johnson, W. H., 71, 75, 160.
- Justification, 51.
- LIBERTARIANISM, 132-134.
- Libido, the Freudian, 72.
- Longfellow, 61, 62.
- Lovejoy, A. O., 69, 71.
- MABIE, H. C., 49.
- Man, created and fashioned, 23, 24, 29, 36-38, 103; his fall, 40-44; a dual being, 18, 23-29; a psychical being, 36-62; his potential powers, 38; not evolved, 23-25, 37, 38; his body fashioned, 39, 40; mind and body partners, 40.
- Marriage, Christian, 72.
- Materialistic psychology, 65, 66.
- McDougall, W., 71, 94, 95, 102, 103, 132, 160.
- McMullen, C. B., 75.
- Memory, 72, 84, 115, 116, 130, 137.
- Mentalism, 13.
- Metaphysics, 9, 10, 79, 112.
- Mind, the human, 9, 10-12, 16, 18, 33; analysis of, 96-138.
- Mind and body, 17, 18, 23-29, 40, 66, 90, 101.
- Mob psychology, 75.
- Molecules, 14, 87.
- Monism, 13, 18; monistic theories, 64-66, 91.
- Morton, H. C., 75.
- Mozley, J. B., 49.
- Mud, man not made of, 24.
- Mullins, E. Y., 49.
- Mystery of mind and matter, 87, 88.
- NERVOUS SYSTEM, the, 13, 98-101; central, 98, 99; peripheral, 99, 100; sympathetic (autonomic), 100, 101.
- Norlie, O. M., 71, 78, 150, 151, 160.
- Noumenon and noumena, 9, 11.
- Neurones, 99, 100, 129, 130.
- ORDER OF SALVATION, the, 18, 49-52, 134.
- O'Toole, G. B., 75.
- PARADISE, 26, 27.
- Parallelism, 66.

- Pardon, assurance of, 54, 55.
- Perception and precepts, 86, 114, 137.
- Personality, 11, 68, 69, 104-106; the ultimate, 119.
- Phenomena, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 87.
- Philosophy, 18, 79, 80.
- Physical basis inadequate, 81, 88.
- Physiology, 17, 34, 79, 90, 129.
- Pillsbury, W. B., 101.
- Plato, 76.
- Plus sign in modern psychology, the, 79-92, 94, 95.
- Pratt, J. B., 61, 70, 71, 78, 161.
- Preachers, psychology for, 148, 149.
- Preaching the gospel, 149.
- Price, G. M., 75.
- Psychical terms in the Bible, 30-35.
- Psycho-analysis, 73, 141.
- Psychology, animal, 10, 11.
- Psychology, Biblical and scientific correlated, 63-138.
- Psychology, Christian, defined, 10; its relations, 17-20, 36; Biblical, 21-62; its Source Book, 21, 22.
- Psychology, General, 4; defined, 9, 10; a science, 14-16, 61, 101, 133, 138.
- Purposive psychology, 94, 95, 160.
- QUALITATIVE DISTINCTIONS**, 86, 87.
- RATIONALISM, 21.
- Reflection, 114, 115, 130, 137.
- Regeneration, 50, 51, 133.
- Reins, the, 33, 34, 98.
- Religious education, 140.
- Religious value of psychology, 140.
- Remensnyder, J. B., 49.
- Repentance, 46, 50.
- Resurrection, 27, 62.
- Reversion, the law of, 74.
- Roback, A. A., 13, 71, 161.
- Robots, 89, 108, 132.
- Roop, H. U., 10, 15, 16, 71, 73, 78, 101, 110, 161.
- Ryan, J. H., 64.
- SALVATION**, psychology of, 45; assurance of, 57, 58.
- Sanctification, 52.
- Schneider, C. O., 152-154.
- Science, physical, 17; and religion, 17, 36, 63, 71 (footnote).
- Self, the, 92, 104-106, 151, 163.
- Self-consciousness (see consciousness).
- Senses, the, 97-101.
- Sense perception, 82-86, 124, 125.
- Sensibilities (emotions, feelings), 127-131.
- Sin, its psychology, 41, 42; its inception, 41, 44; its cure, 45-60.
- Sloan, H. P., 21.
- Snowden, J. H., 78, 117, 161.
- Soul, the, 32 (see mind).
- Speculation, 17, 63.
- Spinal cord, 99.
- Spinoza, 59.
- Spirit, the human, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 32, 35.
- Stalker, J., 49.
- Story-telling, 144.
- Sub-conscious mind, the, 71.
- Suggestion and auto-suggestion, 76.
- Summary of psychical terms in the Bible, 35.
- Synopses, 100.

- TANNER, J. G., 27.
- Teleology, 14.
- Theological Encyclopedia, 19, 20.
- Theology, Christian, 18, 19; Ex-
egetical, Historical, Systemat-
ic, Practical, 20; relation to
psychology, 36, 44, 49, 51, 54,
142 (many other express or
implied references).
- Thorndike, E. L., 70, 129.
- Titchener, E. B., 101.
- Transmutation not proved or
reasonable, 37, 38, 73-75, 88.
- Trichotomy, 23, 27-29, 155, 156.
- UNDERSTANDING, the, 112-125.
- VALENTINE, M., 110.
- Vitalism, 155, 156.
- WATSON, J. B., 68-70.
- Will, the, 34, 35, 131-138; defini-
tion, 131; theories of, 131-134;
determinism, indeterminism,
libertarianism, 131, 132; unique
powers of, 134-136; in action,
136-138; enchained by sin, 142;
use and culture of, 143.
- Wilson, G. A., 71, 104, 163.
- ZELLERS, G. A., 75.

Date Due

1.9 '37

~~1.9 '37~~ 68



Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01014 7058